DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 611 PS 010 015

AUTHOR Katz, Lilian G.; Jacobson, Elaine
TITLE Measures of Development Among Young Children: Socio-Emotional Domain.
INSTITUTION Mediax Associates, Inc., Westport, Conn.
SPONS AGENCY Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 78
CONTRACT HEW-105-77-1006
NOTE 136p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Rating Scales; *Early Childhood Education; *Emotional Development; Evaluation Methods; Interaction Process Analysis; Interpersonal Relationship; *Measurement Instruments; Parent Child Relationship; Peer Relationship; *Personality Assessment; School Attitudes; Self Concept; *Social Development; *Sociometric Techniques; Student Teacher Relationship; Success Factors

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the measurement of behavioral and attitudinal aspects of young children's socioemotional development and briefly describes a variety of instruments designed to measure such development. Information given for each instrument includes: author, source, variables examined, type of measure, age of children test is designed for, and brief comments about the test. Three major types of interactions (peer, adult and task) are discussed in relation tc three levels of contextual variables (geographic and ethnic, situational antecedents, and person with whom interaction occurs). Observational instruments used to assess the development of specified behaviors and attitudes vary with each of the selected dimensions. Among the attitudes examined in the measures described are self concept and school related attitudes. Parental role expectations, peer interaction behavior, classroom behavior and child task interaction are also discussed. In addition, other measures of socioemotional development and the child's social role perception and integration are outlined. Appendices include information on developmental screening tests and observational measures. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HEAD START

ED157611

MEASURES OF DEVELOPMENT AMONG YOUNG CHILDREN:

SOCIO-EMOTIONAL DOMAIN

by

Lilian G. Katz and Elaine Jacobson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ACYF
Publication Office
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS 010015

Prepared by:

MEDIAX ASSOCIATES, INC.
WESTPORT, CONN. 06880

For the

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
CONTRACT NO. HEW-105-77-1006

MEASURES OF DEVELOPMENT AMONG YOUNG CHILDREN:

SOCIO-EMOTIONAL DOMAIN

by

Lilian G. Katz and Elaine Jacobson

ERIC Center on Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois at Urbana

A Report Prepared for the

ACYF/Mediax Program Effects Measurement Project

May, 1978

Mediax Associates, Inc.
21 Charles Street
Westport, Conn. 06880

PS010015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. How Can the Quality of Development Be Assessed?..... 1

II. The Organization of the Present Study..... 11

III. Use of Observational Techniques..... 16

IV. Criterion Behaviors, Attitudes and Corresponding Tests and Measurements: Our Selection of Measures..... 19

1. Self Concept or Attitudes Toward Self..... 20
2. Peers..... 42
3. Classroom Behavior..... 53
4. Child-Task Interaction Styles..... 79
5. School Attitudes..... 96
6. Home and Parents..... 105
7. Child Social Role Perception and Integration..... 117
8. Other Measures of Good Socioemotional Development..... 123

Addendum I..... 124
(Role-taking Skills)

Addendum II..... 125
(Development and Self-Help)

Addendum III..... 126
(Chart of Dimensions by Domains)

Bibliography..... 127

I. HOW CAN THE QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT BE ASSESSED?

It is clear that the Socioemotional domain of development cannot and should not be considered as separate and distinct from the cognitive and perceptual-motor realms, since the organism functions as a whole and each sphere influences and is influenced by the others. Unfortunately, time limitations have compelled us to focus on one section of functioning - the Socioemotional domain.

In order to assess the quality of development it must be decided what types of data will be examined. We have identified two basic types of data i.e.,behavioral and attitudinal data (Areas II, III, IV, VI, B, VIII B, have a behavioral focus. Areas I, V, VI, A, C, and VII have an attitudinal focus.) Again these data are not looked upon as unrelated. That attitudes are expressed in behaviors is obvious; although Fishbein (1977) has cautioned that attitudes are predictable only to specific behaviors. That behavior change can influence attitudes is also evident. A child who, because of being rewarded for paying attention to the teacher, increases his focus on the lesson may develop a more positive attitude toward school tasks - because of his behavior change. Yet despite the interconnectedness of these two types of data, distinquishing between them is thought to be useful because it gives necessary weight to both the clearly observable aspects of socio-emotional development as well as to the equally important but less easily tapped parts of development i.e., feelings, perceptions and attitudes.

Three major types of interactions have been differentiated as follows:

1) Peer (behaviors: Areas II, III and VI B and attitudes: I,VA and VII C).
2) Adult (behaviors: Areas III, VB and attitudes: I and V).
3) Task (behaviors: Areas IV and attitudes IB, VA and B).

Quality of development cannot be conceived of as a list of behaviors and attitudes. Behaviors and attitudes do not operate in a vacuum; their manifestations are contextually determined. For example, a child may show certain types of behavior with other children and a completely different set of responses to adults.

Context is a term usually applied to describe the immediate setting. We have found it to be conceptually helpful to distinguish three levels of contextual variables in the current study. They are: 1) geographic and ethnic variables, 2) to whom the behavior or attitude is directed (e.g.,peer, teacher, or other adult), 3) situational antecedents. For example,the meaning of aggressive behavior on the part of the child varies depending on whether it occurs in response to extreme provocation or in respond to slight frustrations.

In addition to specification of the various contexts of the nature of both behaviors & attitudes, it is necessary to determine the nature of success criteria. Certainly in some areas we cannot accept the proposition that more of the positive or the less of negative behavior or attitude the better. For example, as Anderson-Messick (1974) point out in relation to Self-esteem, "Here is a case in which the goal is not necessarily to develop higher and higher feelings of worth but rather to avoid any instances of extremely negative self-deprecation (At adult levels, positive extremes in self-esteem-grandiosity may also have pathological implications.)" (p. 289). The same point may be made regarding

behaviors toward peers; for example, some dominance behaviors are a good thing but constant dominance to the exclusion of balancing abilities would not be favorable.

Three approaches to these problems may be distinguished: normative, criterion and theoretical approaches. These approaches need not be mutually exclusive. Whatever the approaches, however, they must be developmentally, geographically, ethnically and sex sensitive in determining the types of behaviors and attitudes which would be considered to be indications of the quality of development.

Let us consider each of these approaches separately. The normative approach is advantageous in its attention to developmental, geographical, ethnic and sex variables, but it does not make sense in the present study. If the purpose of Head Start is to improve the quality of development and to improve behaviors and attitudes, then the existing norms for specific populations cannot provide us with a standard of success. More absurd, and less appropriate would be use of the norms for another population, e.g., high s.e.s. or middle class. Anderson and Messick (1974) raise additional questions with regard to a normative approach. Group norms shift over time and there are changes in the meaning of scores at different points on the measurement scale. Furthermore, these authors continue, such an approach tends "to focus attention only on those variables with which they have had a good deal of experience or which have been extensively measured (and that can mean the variables that have been easy and inexpensive to measure)," (p. 286). One should also mention the dangers of a normative approach in possible abusive use of scores for purposes of stereotyping or labeling individuals or

groups.

A theoretical approach is based on theoretical conceptions of the nature of normal or healthy child development and the relationships of the child's behaviors and attitudes to the effects of interactions with his/her environment. As Anderson and Messick (1974) point out, "The approach should have the advantage not only of identifying important variables, but also of considering those variables in hierarchical and independent structures. Mediating and organizing processes in the human being could then become the organizing scheme for structuring and implementing the goals" (p. 286). Although theories may be helpful in suggesting criterion behaviors and attitudes to examine, no theory is developed to the extent of telling us even broadly how much of what traits a child should have, or what a variety of healthy balances of traits, behaviors and attitudes would be.

Theoretical approaches would be more sensitive to longitudinal and sex than to geographical and ethnic variables.

A criterion approach promises much for the present study. Such an approach would focus on criteria for good development at various ages. Parents, teachers, Head Start and elementary school administrators from a variety of geographical, ethnic, background can be solicited for their views. It would not be a prediction of success approach (see cogent criticisms of such an approach by Anderson and Messick, 1974 p. 285). This process could provide a here and now approach - developmentally sensitive to developmental stages and sex variables.

Theory can suggest behaviors and attitudes worthy of study. Approaching teachers, parents and administrators in different geographical, ethnic contexts with this information and exploring

with them definitions of behaviors and attitudes, levels of behaviors to be valued, at various ages and for boys and girls an relevant contextual variables can be profitable. Inputs of teachers, parents and administrators can all be considered and a consensus arrived at. Or parents can be tapped for their views of healthy development at home and teachers and administrators for their views of good development at school.

These groups might be asked to provide information in the following 2 ways:

a) By being asked which of a set of behaviors they would value in the child, as student and as child? in relation to peers, teacher, outside friends, etc. How would they like to see the child develop?

How would they define these behaviors and attitudes? Which are most important - least important?

b) By requesting these groups to select the best developed children based upon extensive descriptions in a broad pool of children - not limited ethnically, socioeconomically or geographically). Then extract the qualities that these children possess, (the types of behaviors and attitudes that these children exhibit). This is somewhat similar to Burton White's approach in the Harvard Study of social competence.

Let us now turn to a delineation of specific attitudes and behaviors which we feel are the components of good development. We propose these as a basis upon which judgements of others, for example, teachers, can be made. Our choices are, to a large extent, based on the work of Anderson and Messick (1974), but include also observations made by the following: Baumrind (1970), White et al (1974), Weinstein

(1969), Hoffman (1975), O'Malley (1977), Shantz (1975), Collins (1977), Raizen et al (1974) and Berger (1977). The selections are based on theoretical dictates (see Anderson and Messick (1974 p. 289) as well as upon behaviors thought to be currently valued by teachers and society.

A. ATTITUDES

1. Self-Concept

a)A Reasonably positive and differentiated self-concept which is reality based. The child is able to differentiate in what situations he is best, alright, not so good, etc. and has a self identity which is quite positive and is fairly constant across time and situations. Realism rather than degree of positiveness is valued. As Anderson and Messick (1974) indicate,"Realistic appraisal of self and feeling of personal worth, while important objectives in their own right, also undergird resiliency in the face of failure or frustration and are reflected in level of aspiration and other motivational processes" (p. 289). (Areas IA and IV F).*

b) Child has feelings of power over his/her own fate within realistic environmental constraints. (Area IC)

c) Child has positive sense of racial identity. (Area IF)

d) Child has reasonably positive feeings about his/her body and physical attributes. (Area IE)

e) Child has reasonably satisfying feelings about him/herself in relationships with his/her peers - i.e. as a member of a group (Area I D)

2. School related attitudes:

a) Child has reasonably good feeling about him/herself as learner and student. (Area I B)

*Please note that Roman Numeral area designations refer to chart - Addendum III

b) Child has reasonably positive attitudes toward his/her teacher, school environment and tasks. (Area V A)

c) Child feels school is important to him/her. (Area V B) and he or she is interested in being successful in school.

B. BEHAVIORS

1. With Peers: (Areas II, III, and VI B)

a) Role-taking behaviors or evidence of good social cognition, i.e., the ability to accurately take the role of the other, to conceptualize the thoughts, emotions, intentions and view points of others. This provides a basis for empathy, for obtaining satisfaction in interpersonal relationships, for predicting the impact that various lines of action or response will have on another and for flexibility - including a large and varied repertoire of appropriate responses.

b) Communication skills - these involve accurate reception. (listening, seeing, understanding), and accurate and competent expression, both verbal and nonverbal. Communication skills have recently been found to relate to social-cognition level in what Delia and Clark (in press) call "listener adapted communication". The present report recognizes the importance of social cognition and communication skills but does not elaborate on these areas for reasons discussed on p. .

c) Child exhibits prosocial behaviors, i.e., child is usually cooperative, helpful and fair when the opportunities present themselves and when situationally expected. As the child matures he/she becomes increasingly so and aware of the principles upon

which such behavior is based.

d) Child displays affection to other children, both verbally and nonverbally.

e) Child forms relatively stable friendships evidencing continued interest in interacting with particular others.

f) Child regulates his/her antisocial behavior.

1. child does not show recurring pattern of disruptive, violent, hostile behaviors.

2. child is able to express aggression in socially acceptable ways - (nonviolent and non-violating of others).

g) Child able to assert verbal social control. Asserts his/her own rights. Shows competitive responses. Shows evidence of dominance behaviors (initiation of activities and interactions.)

h) Child able to follow - and to change response set when necessary - and responds with alternative solutions to interpersonally frustrating circumstances.

j) Child able to play alone.

k) Child enjoys humor, and fantasy play and adult role play.

2) With Teacher Areas III and VII

a) Child is aware of teachers specific role and behaves accordingly.

b) Child displays affection toward and interest in the teacher (approaches teacher positively).

c) Child exhibits prosocial behaviors, usually cooperative, helpful, obedient, dependable. (see I with Peers C).

d) Child regulates his/her antisocial behavior (see 1 with Peers f)

e) Child evidences ability to trust the teacher, to ask for help when needed.

f) Child shows ability to work independent of teacher's help or positive reinforcement, though child is responsive to teacher's attention and positive reinforcement.

3) Task-Related Behaviors (Area IV)

a) Child shows ability to follow directions.

b) Child shows ability to complete tasks and keep attention focused on task-attending to relevant areas for appropriate lengths of time and at appropriate level of concentration. Can work independently, goal-oriented.

c) Child shows competence in taking tests; ie, able to concentrate, willing to cooperate in testing situation.

d) Child shows behavior which is reflective without becoming compulsive, ie., in other words a good balance is struck between reflection and ability to respond.

e) Child evidences creative thinking skills (see Anderson and Messick 1974, p. 91) and a positive disposition toward creative thinking.

f) Child able to set realistic goals for self.

g) Child knows when to seek help. He/she is appropriately self-critical and shows frustration tolerance.

g) Child seeks to improve skills, is pleased with improvement or mastery and seeks learning experiences independent of rewards. Child evidences curiosity.

i) Child selects out relevant learning cues rather than attending to incidental cues.

j) Child has a good range of responses and evidences flexibility under both frustrating and nonfrustrating circumstances.

II. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Our organization of areas and dimensions has been based primarily on the Design for a National Evaluation of Social Competence in Head Start Children by the 1974 Rand Corporation study. (Raisen et al). For an outline of the present study see chart (Addendum III) on page 126. We have been impressed by the scope of the work and the careful discussion of areas and dimensions, in terms of issues and methodological problems. We have differed from the approach of these authors both in a few broad issues and in the focus content of specific areas. In the broad issues we include a stronger emphasis on a longitudinal approach. Zimiles (1-73) cogently argues for a longitudinal approach as follows: "Another problem, well known to everyone but just as widely ignored, which bedevils those who seek a more relevant and comprehensive evaluation of school programs is the fact that a good deal of educational intervention is expected to have future rather than immediate impact. Yet evaluation research is so dominated by a mechanistic, push and pull outlook that we have learned to pretend that whatever findings show up immediately constitute the essential impact of an educational program. Such a perspective invites a narrow and superficial approach to education." (p. 6)

We also stress the quality of child development outside of the academic setting, and on the examination and consideration of the contexts of behavior, and the nature of specific programs in an effort to answer the following questions: 1 - How does Head Start influence the quality of child development? (what are the varied effects as evidenced in behavior and attitudes? 2 - How are these varied effects being achieved? (nature of programs). 3 - With whom (which children) is it achieving these various results? (specification is of numbers of independent variables.) 4 - What is the longitudinal nature of these effects in various subpopulations?

We also would suggest a Consensus approach which implies that the measures and assessment techniques chosen should probably await input from parents, teachers and administrators, so that measures selected will assess aspects of development of interest, concern and value to the population being served and will relate to the goals of specific programs.

More specifically (area by area) we have differed from Raizen et al (1974) in the following ways: Areas I Self-Concept, V School Attitudes, VI Home and Family: We have expanded and refined attitudinal areas by including additional dimensions.

a) Under Self-Concept (I) we have enumerated various aspects of self-concept in addition to the more global concept considered by Raizen et al., ie., as Learner and Student, Locus of Control, Social Self, Body Image and Racial Self Concept. Arguments supporting such an approach are included in the text.

b) Area V (School Attitudes). We have discriminated separate aspects of a child's attitudes toward school: his feelings toward teacher, etc. from the importance the child attaches to school and intellectual pursuits.

c) Area VI (Home and Family). We have included the importance of school success to parents, parent verbally expressed attitudes toward the child's school experience, and parent assessment of the child's behavior at home. (and possibly observer's ratings of child's home behavior.)

d) Area II (Peers). We would emphasize the need for a better conceptual framework and rationale for the selection of particular instruments measuring both sociometric data and peer interaction styles. We would also like to see use of observation instruments not limited to study of behavior during free play time, but rather extended possibly to the examination of several standardized situations. Also recommended would be an instrument which could accommodate specification of antecedents, eg., peer aggression, peer attempted control, peer request for affection.

e) Area III (Classroom Behavior) What Raizen et al (1974) call Role Behavior toward Teachers and Their Responses is really teacher and observer ratings of classroom behavior and includes rating of child-teacher interaction, peer interaction and child-task interaction. Observation of child-teacher interaction in our opinion should include a broader context than a single "arts and crafts period" and should allow for specification of antecedent variables (eg, teacher asks for cooperation, teacher asks question, teacher offers help.) since child response has different meaning depending

on the antecedent conditions. (This will also yield information relevant to teacher training).

We have included several categories omitted by these authors such as reflectivity and creativity, (see Collins, 1977) and have divided others in what we feel should be a more informative manner, such as substituting Attention Control for Direction Following as a strongly related aspect of Task Completion; and Direction Following is considered separately since there are measures which assess this specific area. We have included Response Range as an aspect of Task Behavior and have omitted Achival Data and scales of early adjustment from this section since these data relate to <u>all</u> aspects of a child's school behavior and adjustment. They appear under Area VIII (Other).

We have not included Role-Taking abilities and Communication Skills at this point, not because we devalue the importance of these abilities as building blocks upon which the quality and styles of interpersonal relationships are based, but because preliminary examination of these areas suggested to us that the present state-of-the-art of measurement of role-taking abilities, particularly in the age range under study (3-7 years), does not merit its inclusion at this point. Hoffman (1976), for example, in a review of the literature reports that role-taking abilities are evidenced only as late as 6 years old in laboratory settings, when clinical evidence would argue for a much earlier development. The literature in this area is developing rapidly and a different conclusion might be reached in as little as a year or two.

Precisely because we consider role-taking abilities as so basic to the development of communication skills (Shantz, 1975) and to personality characteristics which are critical to healthy, positive development, and because testing in these areas can be easily translated into remedial teaching tasks, we have included a bibliography of recent studies in the area, (Addenda) in which we delineate some of the aspects of role-taking under consideration in recent literature. A further look at the computer search indicates that current interest is very strong in these areas. Perhaps additional time on an ongoing basis should be devoted to a thorough review of the literature in these areas, in the hope that a basis for devising meaningful ways of assessing role-taking and communication skills can be found.

III. USE OF OBSERVATIONAL TECHNIQUES

It will be noted that many observational techniques are included among the instruments listed*. Although observational techniques are generally more expensive and intrusive, their virtues, in the present context, far outweigh the disadvantages (particularly those "process type" instruments which measure antecedent conditions). Messick and Barrows (1972) have pointed out that "...educational research and evaluations should focus not only upon the outcomes of education but also upon the process and context of education thereby encompassing within its preview several broad areas of measurement concern, input, context, process and outcome." (p.262). Taylor (1976) indicates the wide range of critical data that is lost in an outcome approach: "For instance, what aspects of the teaching procedure or teacher's behavior accounts for any changes that occur? If there is a lack of change, what aspects of the program may account for it? What are the differences among various programs?" (p.3). Zimilies (1973) similarly calls for a more detailed description of the school environment, of antecedent variables, of the independent variables, stating it is "absurd to assess the impact of a program without considering what actually went on in the program." (p. 8)

*For a detailed description of observational instruments see Coller (1972). Bibliography in Taylor (1976).

Examination of context gives information not only as to the bases for changes and development within the child but also an understanding of the nature of children's responses to the measurement tasks. (Anderson et al (1972))-- Observation studies give us more than the "whys" of change or lack of it--they can give us the possibility of guessing at approaching better understanding of the meaning of a particular behavior to a specific child, ie, how salient that behavior is for that particular child and changes in the configuration of personality and social characteristics for the specific child. (See Zimiles, 1973) The problems of salience and configuration of traits and abilities is ignored by more mechanistic measures, and only partially handled by observation techniques--which enable a movement in the right direction.

Context is also an important factor in the initial selection of behaviors and attitudes to be examined, an issue which we shall again consider in our description of criterion behaviors. It might be pointed out that in addition to the data obtained in descriptions of antecedent conditions in the observation instruments included in this report, a broader and more intensive look at context might be desirable. Such an approach is suggested by Zimiles (1973) and Taylor (1976) and is exemplified in recent studies such as Angrist and Borke (1974), or Rentfrow (1975), Rayder et al (1975), Kennedy and Ely (1976). See also techniques described by Coller (1971), which include context of child behavior. Praise for observational techniques must be tempered by consideration of methodological issues and problems. One of the chief problems relates to observer

reliability (See Taylor, 1976 and Susman et al (1976) for discussions of this issue and others.

In sum, it might be stated that observational scales, particularly process measures, can give additional information not available from rating scales in the following ways: (See Bronson, 1975)

a) Information is more objective.

b) Concrete behavioral referents are necessarily given for what is meant.

c) Significant antecedent variables can be identified, (process can be described), giving the possibility of understanding behavior attitude change, its nature and the conditions for such change.

d) Opportunity for understanding the relationship of certain behaviors to the whole.

IV. CRITERION BEHAVIORS/ATTITUDES AND CORRESPONDING TEST MEASUREMENTS

Our Selection of Measures

For each of the selected dimensions we have "identified" existing instruments of measurement which may be used to assess the development of specified behaviors and attitudes. We have endeavored to provide a broad picture of the available instruments within each dimension. Seven major sources were used for the collection of this information: Johnson (1976), Walter (1973), Raizen et al (1974), Guthrie et al (1971), Head Start Test Collection (1973, 1977, 1977), Collins (1977) and Computer Search of Documents. For each measure we have included information that should enable other members of the project to select and further investigate those tests and instruments which appear most useful and relevant. A broad and inclusive listing of tests with brief descriptions should provide the opportunity for selection based upon an understanding of the project as a whole and its demands, and also based upon consideration of criteria determined by the panel of "experts."

1. Self-Concept or Attitudes Toward Self

Self-concept emerges as a central concept in the noncognitive outcomes of education. This is reflected in the increase in the number of studies on self-concept in the early 1970's and the emphasis on the enhancement of the child's self-concept as a critical goal of education, particularly of the disadvantaged. (Shavelson et al, 1976). Rayder et al (1975) in their evaluation of the Responsive Education Program (Head Start and Follow Through programs for children ethnically and culturally different from white middle class children) point to two major objectives for the learner, one of which is the development of a healthy self-concept. They indicate that "In long-range terms, a healthy self-concept is probably the most important single objective in the development of an individual." (p. 5) The relationship between positive self-attitudes and academic success has been well established. (Raizen et al, 1974 p. 229, and Shavelson et al, 1976).

Self-concept (esteem) may be defined as follows: "a persoanl judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself." (Coopersmith, 1967 p 4-5). Self-concept is used in the literature both as a global (general) attribute and as a more differentiated concept. Shavelson et al (1976) point out that general self-concept and differentiated aspects of self-concept have different features. For example, general self-concept appears to be stable, whereas differentiated aspects

of self-concept would be thought to be more situation specific and hence more variable. For this reason we have chosen to include both general measures and more specific measures. The areas we have included in the latter are based both on face validity and on categorization of existing tests. The following 5 specific dimensions have been included, Academic Self-Concept, Locus of Control, Body Image, Racial Self-Concept, and Social Self.

Shavelson et al (1976) caution that the state-of-the-art of measurement of self-concept is still problematic, despite the recent surge of interest. Validity is questionable on the grounds of imprecision of definitions making it difficult to specify for particular instrument the "population of subjects for which the measurement techniques and interpretations would be appropriate" (p. 408), and the lack of clarity of conceptual dimensions on which the definitions could be classified. These authors additionally stress that for a given instrument, "data suggest that generalization of construct interpretations across different populations of subjects may be hazardous" (p. 409). We would suggest in attempting to partially deal with these problems that individual interviews should be conducted with subsamples (varying cultural and geographic backgrounds) of subjects to reveal the most meaningful and important (consistent across groups) self-evaluative dimensions in general self-concept, specifically those which are fairly consistent across groups.

It should additionally be pointed out that recent literature has revealed the importance of the effects of race of experimenter or tester on the measurement of self-concept and in particular the measurement of racial self-identity (eg. Starkey and Boyie, 1975). We have separated self-report measures from what we have called "inferred self-concept", ie, the assessment of self-concept by others based on overt behaviors. It should be noted that the two types of scales have not been shown to be highly correlated. (Shavelson et al, 1976).

Another issue which deserves consideration is the question of differentiation of self-concept. It is important for a child to have a reasonable view of himself, his body, his abilities to relate to others, etc.; but wouldn't realistic self-appraisal as compared with globally super-positive self-esteem be the goal of good "quality of development"? To a small extent the correlation between aspiration level and achievement on specific tasks is considered in Area IV. But perhaps examination of self-concept in light of data obtained in other areas (such as Areas II, peer interrelations and III classroom behavior etc) might provide more useful information.

A) General Self-Esteem

"A personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 4-5).

a) Tests which are based on information obtained directly from child

1. Preschool Self-Concept Picture Test

Author: R.B. Woolner

Source: Johnson (1976) pp 708-709.

Variable: Incongruence between self and ideal self concept.

Type of M: Nonverbal interview, forced chorie

Age: Early childhood (approx. 3-7 yrs.)

Comment: different sets available appropriate to black and white, boys and girls.

2. Brown IDS Self-Concept Reference Test

Author: B. Brosn

Source: Walker (1973) pp 231-233.

Variable: Self-concept

Type of M: Self-report, dichotomous choice

Age: preschool to K

Comment: Norms available for variety of populations - age ranges. There is a follow through version.

3. Pictorial Self-Concept Scales

Authors: A.S. Bolea, P.W. Felker and M.D. Barnes

Source: Walker (1973 p. 244)

Variable: Self-Concept

Type of M: Nonverbal Self-report inventory, sorting task.

Age: K to 4th grade

Comments: Based on Jersid's (1952) self-concept categories. Good reliability. Validity for minority groups, has not been assessed.

4. Thomas Self-Concept Values Test

Authors: W.L. Thomas

Source: Walker (1973, pp253-254)

Variable: Self-Concept

Type of M: Verbal self-report inventory

Age: 3-9 years

Comments: Child makes selections assuming perspectives of self, mother, teacher, and pears, self-concept scores for each of these perspectives available, as well as a total self-concept score. Reliability was tested using Head Start Children.

5. McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale

Authors: E.D. McDaniel and E.V. Piers

Source: Johnson (1976, pp 698-699)

Variable: Self-Concept

Type of M: Questionnaire

Age: 6-9 years

Comments: This test is a revision for younger children

of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. Would require further revision for H.S. purposes. The verbal nature in the text might provide difficulties in this regard. Has 3 part score in addition to total score ie. Feeling Self, School Self, and Behaving Self.

6. How I See Myself Scale

Author: I.J. Gordon

Source: Shavelson et al (1976, pp427-428)

Variable: Self-Concepts

Type of M: Self-rating scale 5 point

Age: 3-6 and 7-12 (2 forms)

Comments: At present, the scale is most often used to measure changes in certain aspects of self-concept resulting from intervention programs.

7. Self-Observation Scales: Primary

Authors: A. J. Stenner and W. G. Katzen Meyer

Source: Head Start Test Collection - Tests for Spanish

Variables: Self-Acceptance, Self-Security

Type of M:

Ages: k - Grade 3

Comments: Measures also Social Maturity, School Affiliation and Achievement Motivation (See V - B). A Spanish version is also available.

8. The Columbus Picture Analysis of Growth Toward Maturity

Author: M.J. Langeveld

Source: Guthrie (1971)

Variable: Child's relation to self, to parents, educators, peers and others in situations related to growing maturity and self-reliance

Type of M: Projective Test

Age: 5 to maturity

Comments: Interviewer requires a lot of training.

9. Primary Self-Concept Inventory

See I - B

10. Self-Observation Scales: Primary

See V B 2

Includes following 5 dimensions: Self-Acceptance, Social Maturity, School Affiliation, Self-Security and Achievement Motivation.

11. Children's Self-Social Constructs Test: Preschool Form - Self-Esteem subtest.

Authors: B.H. Long and E.H. Henderson

Source: Walker (1973) pp235-236

Variables: How child feels about self in comparison with other children, social interest and dependency, identification and preference for others, realism as to size and minority identification. Both Head Start and middle class children tested. Head Start children's scores were significantly lower than middle class children's. In a longitudinal study, self-esteem scores increased significantly between K entrance and end of 1st grade.

12. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

Source: Johnson (1976 p 685)

Has been used very widely but age of use is 9 years to adult.

b. Tests which are based on ratings or observations of others, also called "inferred self concept".

1. Inferred Self-Concept Judgment Scale

Author:

Source: Walker (1973 p. 239) E0019 124

Variable: Self-concept

Type of M: Rating Scale

Age: Preschool to 3rd grade.

Comments: Test with culturally varied low income children.

2. Perception Score Sheet

Authors: A.W. Combs and D.A. Soper

Source: Walker (1973 p. 243)

Variables: Self generally, self as instrument, self worth peers, self with adults, self with teacher, self and the school curriculum, perceptions of children, perceptions of adults, perceptions of teachers, perceptions of schools.

Type of M: Observational technique, rating scale

Age: K - 2nd grade

Comments: Can separate scores for the various areas be reliably obtained?

3. Self-Concept Sub Scale of Evaluation Scale (SCES)

Authors: A.L. Butler, M. Church, M. Swayzi

Source: Walker (1973 p. 250

Variable: General self-concept

Type of M: Rating scale based on observations interviews and projectives.

Age: Preschool to K.

Comments: Need Highly trained raters. Validity measures not available, includes assessment of self-awareness, feelings about self, progress toward self-sufficiency, task involvement, openness to new experiences and ability to relate to others. Has a broad spectrum of data on which to base judgments.

4. Evaluation Scale of 4 and 5 year old children

Authors: A.L. Butler, M. Church, M. Swayzi

Source: Coller, (1971 p. 21)

Variable: SElf concept, child relation to other people, child in relation to his physical environment and the child in relation to the world of idea.

Type of M: Observational technique

Age: Kindergarten

List of Tests thought to be of less potential value:

General Self-Concepts

1. Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept

Authors: McNamara et al see Walker (1973 p. 234)

No validity reported.

2. Riley Preschool Developmental Screening Inventory

Author: C. Riley, wee Walker (1973 p. 247).

Projective technique which require well trained persons to administer and score - validity and reliability of measure not available.

3. U - Scale Self - Concept Test

Authors: R. J. Ozehosky & C. T. Clark see Walker (1973 p. 255)

Only for Kindergarten, - Self-concept on this scale was related to achievement and teacher's perceptions of children's self-concepts but results of the U Scale were found to be contradictory to other self-concept measures.

4. How I Perceive Myself

Author: E. -Do Rim see Johnson (1976 pp 692-693)

Questionable reliability (contains only 10 items). Validity not yet checked.

b. Self-Concept as Learner and Student

1. Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Author: D. Muller & R. Leonette

Source: Johnson, 1976, pp 709-710

Variable: Self-concept factors relevant to school success.

Type of M: Dichotomous pictorial stimuli self-report.

Age: 4-12

Comments: It was designed to provide an economical procedure for evaluating several aspects of self-concept relevant to school success. Initially constructed for use with Spanish/Mexican descent children but shown used successfully with Anglo-American and Indian children. Stories printed in both Spanish and English. Three major domains: Personal Self, Social Self and Intellectual Self measured.

2. Faces Scale

Author: J. R. Frymier

Source: Walker (1973 p. 237)

Variable: self-concept with regard to school

Type of M: Self-report inventory

Age: 5 - 10

Comment: Used in Follow-Through pilot studies.

3. Learner Self-Concept Scale L-SC

Author: New York State Education Department

Source: Walker (1973 p. 241)

Variable: Self-concept as learner in regard to teachers, peers and classroom material.

Type of M: Self-report, semi-projective inventory

Age: Preschool

Comment: Forms available for White and Nonwhite Males and Females. Could possibly be applied to older children.

4. McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept

Author: E. E. Gotts

Source: Johnson (1976 pp 677-679)

Variable: Arithmetic self-concept, academic self-concept.

Age: Elementary

Type of M: Questionnaire with self-ratings.

Comments: Field study indicated that children spontaneously conceptualize self in this area in the following ways. a) amount of accomplishment. b) ability to perform competitively with peers. c) liking for subject. d) progress as judged by teacher. e) how smart teacher thinks child is. f) whether child is able to complete correctly particular tasks. Test was developed along these lines. The seven point scale employed would need to be simplified for use with younger children and only the academic self-concept portion would be relevant.

I.

B.

b) Tests of inferred self-concept as learner

(Rating Scales)

1. Florida Key: A Scale to Infer Learner Self-Concept

Authors: W. W. Purkey, B. N. Cage, W. Graves

Source: Johnson (1976, pp 689-691)

Variable: Student self-image as learner

Type of Measure: Rating Scale

Age: Preschool

Comments: Four factors were identified: relating, asserting, investing and coping.

2. Perception Score Sheet

See I A. B. 2

Less desireable tests of Self-Concept as learner and student

1. Self-Concept Interview

Authors: Fitzgibbon and G. Nimmicht.

see Walker, 1973, p. 248

Comments: reliability not available, validity measures low, only applies to kindergarten.

I.

C. Locus of Control

A child's efficacy in handling both social and academic situations is in no small measure related to whether or not he/she feels able to influence and shape events. Anderson & Messick (1974)

refer to this as, "the concept of self as initiating and controlling agent," which they define as follows. "The child tends to initiate action and direct his own behavior within realistic environmental constraints, he does not feel (italics ours) powerless or a pawn of environmental forces." p. 289. Minorities, with good reason, have frequently felt powerless and a pawn of the environment. Bruner (1975), cites a study by Maxine Schoggen (1969) in which she measured EFV's (environmental force units), "an act by any social agent in the child's environment directed toward getting the child to seek a goal." for lower and middle class families. Lower class children were found to be far lower in EFV's per/minute than middle class children, suggesting that the culture of poverty induces a feeling of helplessness in the adults which is passed on to the children in terms of under-stress of goal-directedness.

As Dr. Brunner eloquently states, "...But in effect, insofar as a subculture represents a reaction to defeat and insofar as it is caught by a sense of powerlessness, it suppresses the potential of those who grow up under its sway by discouraging problem solving. The source of powerlessness that such a subculture generates, no matter how moving its by-products, produces instability in the society and unfulfilled promise in human beings." To translate this argument into terms appropriate to our context, we might suggest that to the extent that a child increases feelings of himself as a significant determinant in the direction of his/her own behavior in his/her school environment, gains in positive attitude toward school and in academic functioning would be expected.

It is interesting to note that in a study using the "Locus of Control Inventory", achievement and IQ measures, Follow-Through students were found to increase in Locus of Control scores as compared to controls even more than in achievement and IQ measures. (Johnson, 1976, p. 664).

1. Stephen Delys Reinforcement Contingency Interview

Authors: Stephens & Delys

Source: Collins, 1977 p. 256

Variable: Locus of control.

Type of M: Self-report inventory, open choice.

Age: Preschool

2. ETS: Locus of Control Scale

Author: N. Shipman

Source: Walker (1973, pp. 179-180)

Variable: Locus of Control, Internal-External Cause

Type of M: Self-report; forced-choice inventory

Age: 5 1/2 to 7 1/2 years.

Comments: Sets of pictures available for Black and White boys and girls. This test was adapted from similar test developed for Follow-Through evaluation.

3. Locus of Control Interview (LCI)

Authors: C. Malasky, M.F. Shore, N. Milgram

Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 663-664)

Variable: Locus of control

Type of M: Semistructured interview

Age: 4-9 years

Comments: Piaget type exploratory interview designed especially for young children with limited verbal ability. Used with middle and lower class children. Study found that discrepancy between the two classes increased with increasing age. Used with Follow Through children.

4. Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Scale

Author: Stanford Research Institute

Source: Collins (1977, p. 257)

Variable: Locus of Control, Internal-External Causation

Type of M: Self-report inventory, forced choice

Ages: 3rd grade Follow Through.

D. Social Self-Concept

This area considers the self in relation to peers, i.e., how the child feels about himself/herself as a social being, and how he/she thinks others feel about him/her.

1. Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test

Refer to I, A, a, 2.

Comment: Includes section on how children feel mothers, teachers and peers view them.

2. Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Refer to I, B, a, 1.

Comment: Includes social-self domain.

3. Self Observation Scales: Primary

Refer to I, A, a, 7.

Comment: Measures Social Maturity.

4. Faces Scale

See I, B, a, 2.

Comment: Measures social relationships (also home situations).

5. Perception Score Sheet

Refer to I, A, b, 1.

6. Children's Self-Social Constructs Test: Preschool Form - Esteem Subtest

Refer to I, A, a, 11.

I.

D. Body Image

This includes the feelings the child has toward his body, his feelings of attractiveness, strength, health and size.

1. Children's Self-social Constructs Test: Preschool Form - Self-Esteem Subtest

Refer to I, A, a, 11.

Comments: Measures realism as to size.

2. Primary Self-Concept Inventory

Refer to I, B, a, 1.

Comment: Personal Self dimension includes physical size and emotional state.

3. Faces Scale

Refer to I, B, a, 2.

Comment: includes section on physical development.

4. Thomas Self-Concept Values Test

Refer to I, A, a, 4.

Comment: Includes a value dimension of size, health and attractiveness, strength, male acceptance, cleanliness.

5. Body Size Concept Test and Body Image Test

Author: F.A. Mulhauser

Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 681-682)

Variable: Concept of body size and body image.

Type of M: Test

Age: 4-6 years.

F. Racial Self-Concept

Racial Self-Concept includes the evaluative feelings of the child toward members of his/her own race in comparison with feelings toward others. It also considers the tendency of the child to identify with his/her own race. It is interesting to note that in an assessment of empirical evidence in support of construct interpretation of Gordon's How I See Myself Scale, it was reported that the item, "My skin is nice looking" loaded on the factor of academic adequacy. Shavelson et al (1976, p. 428).

1. Moreland Picture Interview

Author: J.K. Morland

Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 1110-1111)

Variable: Racial acceptance, preference, self-identification and classification ability.

Type of M: Structure interviews with pictures.

Age: 3-9 years

Comment: Well structured test, high reliability.

2. Children's Self-Social Constructs Test: Preschool Form, - Self Esteem Subtest

Refer to I, A, a, 11.

3. Preschool Racial Attitude Measure

Author: J. E. Williams

Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 1120-1121)

Variable: Evaluative responses to Euro- and Afro-American persons.

Type of M: Picture-story interview.

Age: 3-9 years.

4. Social Interaction Test

Author: J. M. Handler

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 1138)

Variable: Children's verbal attitudes toward black and white children.

Type of M: Structured interview with projective test.

Comment: Test designed to be used with kindergarten children in integrated suburban schools to determine their verbal social perception of white and black children after particular intervening experiences.

5. Tricultural Attitude Scale

Author: P.A. Zerkel

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 1149)

Variable: Attitudes and knowledge: Puerto Rican, Anglo-American and Black American cultures.

Type of M: Pictorial scale.

Comment: Test designed for evaluation of programs that propose to enhance ethnic identity or cross-cultural understanding among any one or more of these three target groups.

6. Racial Attitude Sex-Role Picture Series

Authors: J.E. Williams, J.K. Roberson

Source: Walker (1973, p. 57)

Variable: Racial attitudes (also views on sex-roles)

Type of M: Self-report, semiprojective inventory, based on Osgood's Semantic Differential.

Age: Preschool to K.

7. Social Schematic

Author: Educational Testing Service

Source: Walker (1973, p. 61)

Variable: Interpersonal racial attitudes.

Type of M: Self-report, semiprojective

Age: 4 1/2 - 9 years.

Comment: Used in second years of the ETS Head Start Longitudinal Study (Shipman 1972).

8. Color-Meaning Picture Test Revised

Author: J. E. Williams

Source: Guthrie (1971, p. 24)

Variable: Racial attitudes.

Type of M: Picture test.

Age: 3 - 6 years.

Comments: Racial attitudes measured by the evaluative connotations of colors.

2. Peers

A. Peer Acceptance:

Extremes of peer acceptance or rejection have been found to be predictive of later emotional adjustment. The desire or lack of desire of peers to associate with a particular child seems to be rapidly stabilizing in kindergarten and first grade. (Raizen et al, 1974, pp. 160-161) (Asher, 1976). Sociometric techniques have long been used to assess level of peer acceptance or rejection. For our purposes the children who are social outcasts and those who are the most popular would be appropriate. Such an instrument would enable us to answer questions such as: Does Head Start help children at the negative end of the spectrum to develop necessary social skills to move them away from that end when they attend first grade? Do those children at the top of the Head Start list retain their popularity in first grade? Ethnic parameters of choice, represented by the number of inter- and intra- racial nominations should be explored, particularly in the first grade context if general SES level of the classroom is higher than of Head Start children. The effects of this socio-economic background discrepency might be reflected in data related to school attitudes and self attitudes. (Raizen et al, 1974).

An undifferentiated friendship choice would probably be most appropriate to this age range and would give information sufficient for identifying the extremes in sociometric choices: This information can be elicited through requesting three positive and three

negative sociometric choices as suggested by Raizen et al., (1974, p. 161). The method of administration found in the following test can be used.

1. Minnesota Sociometric Status Test

Author: S. G. Moore - Institute of Child Development.

Source: Guthrie (1971)

Variable: Sociometric status, social acceptance.

Type of M: sociometric.

Age: 3-5 (but could be used with older children).

It might be considered that the same type of information could be obtained without the use of separate sociometric measure, simply as one of the sets of data available from a Classroom Observation technique (See II-B #6 e.g. McCandless-Marshall Play Interaction Measure).

B. Peer Interaction Style

Behavior twoard peers is universally accepted as an important aspect of child development (e.g. Baumrind, 1970, White, 1974, Anderson & Messick, 1974, etc.). Gottman et al (1975) examined the relationship between social skills, social interaction and popularity in third and fourth grades in middle and low income schools and found that popular and unpopular children differed in their knowledge of how to make friends, on observational measures and on the referential communication task (with significant interaction effect of income level).

In other words, popularity, in some sense was related to specific

ways of relating to other children and specific skills the child has in dealing with peers. For an understanding of the effect of Head Start on the development of social skills, use of an observational technique is recommended, (See pp. 17-19). As Soar & Soar (1972) state, "How better to measure pupil socialization than to record the way they respond to each other as they initiate and pursue a task which is real to them". (p. 256).

Choice of the specific categories of behavior to be observed and the criteria for evaluation of the data has been discussed in the introduction. The major questions this section addresses are:

- What changes in behaviors toward peers occurs as a result of the Head Start experience?
- How do these changes relate to specific program, geographic and ethnic variables?
- How do these changes relate to out of school behavior? and to teachers' perceptions of child's peer interactions?

Observation of more than a free play period is recommended, e.g., semi-structured play period. It would also be advantageous to use an instrument which would allow for identification of antecedents and nature of situational variables, e.g., competitive situations, cooperative situations, aggressive acts from others, affectionate behavior initiated by another, etc. , in order to see how the child responds in varying situations, and to be able to assess appropriateness of the response to the context - not only the frequency and relative frequencies of behaviors.

1. Executive Skill Profile

Author: M. B. Bronson - Harvard University, Laboratory of Human Development, Roy E. Larsen Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138

Source: PSOO7906

Variables: Social Skills.

Age: 3-5, recently used with first and second graders.

Type of M: Observation technique.

Comments: Social skills defined by the following categories of observation: time spent in social play, cooperative play, associative play, parallel play, conversation, fantasy, no activities, number of incidents of social control of peers, competitive responses, successful competition, being controlled by peers, offering social help, using cooperative strategies, asserting verbal social control, asserting rights, not accepting rules, resisting peers, resisting peers success, hostility, showing positive and negative social affect.

2. Stevenson Behavior Unit Observational Procedure

Author: H. W. Stevenson & N. G. Stevenson

Source: Walker (1973, p. 299)

Variable: Social behaviors.

Type of M: Systematic observation categories.

Age: Preschool to K.

Comments: Social behaviors are defined and coded as follows: Social Participation, Lack of Social Pariticipation,

Interactive, Attentive or Noninteractive, Social Control, Response to Social Control, Initiation of Aggression, Friendliness, Unfriendliness, Contacts with Adults, Routine or Group Situation. A child's race did not influence the type or degree of social interaction he had with other group members. It did not influence the type or degree of social interaction he had with other group members. It did influence the number of social behaviors.

3. Social Behavior Checklist

Authors: D. Oglevie & B. Shapiro

Source: Walker (1973, pp. 288-290)

Variable: Social competence.

Type of M: Systematic observation categories.

Ages: 1-6 years.

Comments: Procedure developed to use in Pre-School project at Harvard (White et al). 13 categories of interaction with peers are included: Attention of peers, resource-instrumental, Leads positive or neutral, Leads negative, Model, Folows-Verbal, Follows-nonverbal, Refuses to follow, Imitation of peer, Affection, Hostility, Competes for attention, and Competes for equipment.

Raizen et al (1974) recommend use of the Social Behavior Checklist possibly supplemented by some of Bronson's categories. It might be recommended that ethnic aspects of peer interaction might be included (i.e. initiations of interracial contact), in order to relate these to academic self-concept, racial

self-identity, and school attitudes. A behavioral indication of social isolates might also be obtained.

4. Peer Interaction Recording System (PIRS)

Authors: B. Garrett, H. Hops, N.M. Todd, H. M. Walker

Variable: Social interactive behavior in the classroom setting.

Type of M: Observation technique.

Source: ED 131937 PS 008959, Oregon University, Center for Research in the Behavioral Education of the Handicapped.

Comments: Primary use for identification of socially deviant children and observing program effects on the social behavior of these children. Rate and frequency of positive and negative interactions and percentage of positive interactions are measured. Type of interaction, verbal, non verbal, physical and imitation of interaction are also assessed.

5. Observation of Socialization Behavior (OSB)

Authors: J. Cunningham & R. Boger

Variable: Peer-group interaction.

Type of M: Observation technique.

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 1190)

Age: 3-8 years.

Comments: The strong catagories and number of interaction behavior classes under each are: emotional tone (5), social behavior (6), nonverbal behavior (5), physical behavior (5), nonverbal - play context (5), verbalization

(15), involvement (12), peer interaction (2), group interaction (1), adult interaction (1), and inferred motivation (14).

6. McCandless - Marshall Play Interaction Measure

Authors: B.R. McCandless & H.R. Marshall

Source: Guthrie (1971)

Variable: Social interactions

Type of Measure: Observation Technique

Age: Developed with 3 - 5 year olds, but could be used with older children.

Comments: Variables recorded and scored (in free play situations) include: associative play, friendly approach, conversation and hostile approach. (attention is recorded but not scored). Measure of peer acceptance (II, A) is observable.

7. Mummery Scale of Ascendant Behavior

Author: D. V. Mummery

Source: Guthrie (1971, p. 19)

Variable: Socially mature and socially unacceptable behavior.

Type of M: Observation in controlled play situation.

Ages: 3 - 5 years.

Comment: 79 categories of ascendant behavior tapped and desireability ratings assigned to each. Categories consist of verbal and physical methods of securing play materials, of directing companions and of verbal and physical responses to these methods.

8. Parten Social Participation Measure

Author : M. B. Parten

Source : Guthrie (1971, p. 20)

Variable : Degree of socialization in play behavior.

Type of M : Observation in free play.

Ages : Nursery, but could be used with older children.

Comment : Categories include unoccupied behavior, onlooker, solitary independent play, parallel activity, associative play and cooperative play; leadership (independent pursuing of own will, directing, following, reciprocally directing, and intermediate position).

C. Response Range in Relation to Interpersonal Stimuli

This section includes measures of role resiliency in response to frustrating and non-frustrating interpersonal situations. There has been much recent concern for whether children have learned socially responsive behavior, in behavioral terms this would mean assessing whether "children have available a range of positive options in their interpersonal problem-solving repertoires." (Raizen et.al., 1974, p.219)

Response Range - non frustrating situation

1. What Happens Next ?

Authors : Spivak and Shure

Source : Raizen et. al. (1974, pp. 220-221)

Variable : Consequential reasoning ability.

Type of M : Story Completion.

Comments : See Raizen for discussion of test and relevant issues.

Response Range - frustrating situation

1. Preschool Interpersonal Problem-Solving Test (PIPS)

Authors : M.B. Shure and G. Spivack.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 565-567)

Type of M : Story Completion.

Variable : Interpersonal problem-solving thinking skills.

Age : 4-5 years.

Comments : See relevant discussion in Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 221-222)

The most extensive research has been done with 4-yr-old inner city children. " Means, standard deviations and cumulative percentages by behavior groups are presented in a manual for 469 - 4 yr old inner-city children - over a four year period. Consistently, adjusted youngsters offered a greater number and a wider range of alternative solutions to real life problems than did their more impulsive or inhibited classmates. Further validity of the PIPS Test is evidenced by its relationship to socioeconomic status (comparing lower

SES with middle SES groups) and its relationship to specific interpersonal behaviors. Research findings also indicate the PIPS doesn't measure general cognitive 'power' or IQ and is independent of general language skill. Subsequent data also show test validity in 5-year-old inner-city kindergarten children with respect to behavior adjustment group, IQ and language skills." (Johnson, p. 566)

3. Classroom Behavior

A. Evaluation Based on Teacher's Own Set of Role Expectations

The following questions can be addressed by measures listed in this section.

a. how the teacher articulates student role qualities to herself and how well she feels the child has perceived and satisfied these expectations; The measure to be used allows for regional, ethnic and experience differences among teachers to be expressed and utilized.

b. how congruent are the student role expectations of Head Start and elementary teachers in the same area ?

c. how congruent are teacher perceptions with peer observational data and possibly with observer ratings and home ratings ?

d. how congruent are constructs and their meanings with those of parents and administrators conceptions ?

For this purpose the following test is recommended:

1. Kelly's (1955) - Role Construct Repertory Test
   See Raizen et. al., 1974, pp. 170-171 and 174-175 for a fine discussion of the use of this test and related questions of interpretation and of evaluative constructs.

B. Teachers' (or observers) Evaluations Based on Standardized Constructs

- A choice must be made between using the teacher and/or an observer (possibly the same people involved in Area II B) as the rater.

- Choice of measures allowing for longitudinal assessment i.e., how Head Start children are faring compared with controls with respect to these generally accepted evaluative dimensions.

- These measures include assessments of peer interaction and can be related to the observational data obtained in section II B.

- Two types of measures are included:
  a. general inventories, b. those specifically designed as "screening-devices" to assess problem behavior.

- Choice of test can be made partially on the basis of closeness of constructs to a consensus of those chosen by the four primary groups (parents, teachers, administrators, panel of researchers). For a discussion of categories we feel are important in determining the "quality of development" see pp 8-9.

- Choice of test must consider relative desirability

of ratings requiring the teachers to weigh behaviors on a quantitative scales and those where teacher selects the behavior that best describes the child's usual mode of behavior in given situations.

- Choice of test must consider the clarity of behavioral definitions.

a. General Inventories

1. Behavior Rating Scales for School Beginners

Authors : B. H. Long and C. H. Henderson

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 543-544)

Variable : Adjustment to school.

Type of M : Rating Scales

Comments : Items partially derived from Medinnus' First Grade Adjustment scale. See the following articles written by Henderson and Long,

Personal and social correlates of academic success among disadvantages school beginners. J. School Psychol., 1971, 9, 101-113.

also Teachers' judgements of black and white school beginners. Sociology of Education 1971, 44, 358-368.

2. Pupil Behavior Checklist.

Author : F Rhodes

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1023-1024)

Variable : Attitude toward school and learning as indicated

by classroom behaviors.

Type of M : Thurstone checklist.

Age : K - Grade Six

3. Nursery School Behavior Inventory

Author : R. N. Walker

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 433-434)

Variable : Teacher judgements of 66 behavior traits, summarized in nine temperament variables.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 2-5 years.

Comment : Format resembles California Behavior Inventory from which many of the items were drawn. Cluster score; energetic, active, alert, curious, agressive, assertive, fearful, anxious, social-friendly, unstable-excitable, cooperative-conforming, cheerful, expressive, sensitive-easily hurt. Parents of students predominantly professionals and managers. Compare Walker's two tests in which parents rate children i.e., Child Behavior Checklist VII B-1 and Scale for Parents' Rating VII B-3

4. Evaluation Scale for 4 and 5 Year Old Children

Author : A. L. Butler.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 70-71)

Variable : School behavior in affective, cognitive and physical areas, and self-concept.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age - 4-5 years.

Comment : A profile can be prepared on the basis of the teacher's observations of the child at intervals throughout the year. No reliability or validity reported.

5. Pre Kindergarten Scale

Author : T. M. Flynn

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 112-114)

Variable : Cognitive skills, self-control, relationship with achievement model, dependency.

Age : 3-5 years.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Comments : Uses multiple choice format - behaviors are defined as unambiguously as possible. See Author's article, (with H. Curtis) Traits Related to Achievement Motivation in Migrant Children. Migrant Project Report; Florida State University, Talahassee, 1970.

6. Preschool Rating Scale

Authors : W.F. Barker, L. Sandler, A. Bornemann, G. Knight.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 114-116)

Variable : Personal-social development.

Type of M : Rating scale (Guttman)

Comments : Ratings in five areas (coordination, verbal expression, auditory understanding, orientations, and social relations). Items are behaviorally specific, Scale is described as being easy to use and gives useful information to researcher and day-care worker - Norms were developed from both urband and suburban advantaged and disadvantaged males and females. One set of norms was found, on the basis of research, to be appropriate for all groups. Experience has shown this instrument to be useful for screening, program evaluation, to assess effectiveness of day-care personnel, to teach day-care personnel, to help day-care workers identify specific areas of development that might need remediation.

7. School Adjustment Scale

Author : J. M. Flynn.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 570-571)

Variable : School adjustment.

Type of M : Rating scale, multiple choice.

Age : 6-13 years.

Comments : Defines behavior as unambiguously as possible. Does not require teacher to weigh behaviors on a quantitative scale - instead teacher selects behavior that best describes child's usual mode of behavior in

the situation. Could be adapted for use with younger children.

8. School Records Coding Manual and Pupil Rating Form

Author : N. F. Watt

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 576-577)

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Coding system and rating scale (see also Area VIII A)

Age : Teachers of children 5-18.

Comment: Instruments still at the level of pilot research. Coordinates archival data with assessments of behavior. Teacher rates child from 1-15 in a variety of characteristics. Preliminary analyses showed very promising validity even longitudinally.

9. High/Scope Pupil Observation Checklist

Author : Delora et. al.

Source : Collins (1977, p. 270)

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Rating scale (7 pt.).

Age :

Comments : The following dimensions are included; sensitive-cooperative, shy-sociable, outgoing-withdrawn, involved, indifferent, defensive-agreeable, active-passive, gives up-keeps trying, quiet-talkative, attentive-inattentive.

10. Child Behavior Survey Instrument

Author : L. G. Katz

Source : E D 0 3 7 2 3 0, P S 0 0 0 0 8 0 0

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M :

Age :

Comments : Nine major categories included: orientation, subjective mood, motibility, motivation, cognitive behavior, satisfaction, interaction between child and teacherm interaction between child and child and verbalization. Each of these categories has sub-categories with which the child's behavior can be categorized.

11. Project Head Start Behavior Inventory

Author : Project Head Start.

Source : Guthrie (1971, p. 12)

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Questionnaire (50 four pt. rating scales)

Age :

Comments : Nine subscales: sociability, independence, curiosity, persistance, emotionality, self-confidence, jealousy, achievement, and leadership. Cumulative percentile norms for each of the subscales available by sex, urban/non urban, race, age and geographic region.

12. California Preschool Social Competency Scale (CPSCS)

Authors : S. Levine, F. F. Elvey, M. Lewis

Source : Guthrie (1971, p. 15)

Variable : Interpersonal behavior and degree of social responsibility.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 2-5 years.

Comments : Behaviors included are situational in nature and were selected in terms of common cultural expectations to represent basic competencies to be developed in the process of socialization. Each item contains four descriptive statements in behavioral terms representing various degrees of competency. Age percent norms by occupational level and total sample available.

See:

Test Review No. 17. California Preschool Social Competency Scale. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8 (4) 391-5.

13. Kohn Social Competence Scale

Author : M. Kohn

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1183-1185)

Variable : Social-emotional functioning.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 3-6 years.

Comment: Designed to asses child's mastery of a kindergarten, or preschool setting. Scale measures two bipolar dimensions of children's social emotional functioning, interest-participation vs. apathy-withdrawal and cooperation-compliance vs. anger - defiance. The higher the child on apathy - withdrawal the lower the scholastic achievement during elementary school .

14. Classroom Behavior Inventory : Preschool to Primary

Authors : E. S. Schaeffer and M. Aaronson.

Source : Head Start Test Collection

Measures of Social Skills (1977, p.4) see also Walker (1973, pp.174-176)

Variables : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : Preschool - Grade Three

Comments : Behaviors classified into 12 categories : verbal expressiveness, hyperactivity, kindness, social withdrawal, perserverance, irritabilitym gregariousness, distractibility, considerateness, self-consciousness, concentration and resentfulness. Ratings according to how much of a specific behavior a child exhibits. There is a short form - appropriate for grades K - 12 in which six categories of behavior are included (extraversion, task-oriented behavior, introversion,

distractibility, hostility and considerateness). See Raizen et. al. (1974, p. 172) for a discussion of this test. Its selection was recommended primarily on the basis that it samples the content of the three - 2nd order factors that have been found over and over again to emerge from factory analysis of teachers' ratings of classroom behavior of children.

Means and standard deviations for each of the three subtests for the total fall 1971 Head Start Planned Variation sample and subsamples (males, females, black, white, Mexican American children, children with and without previous preschool experience) are available. Used in the Head Start Planned Variation Study (1973) and in pilot year of Home Start Study (Hi Scope, 1973).

15. Teacher Rating Scale

Author : G. Rubenstein and L. Fisher

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills (1971, p. 11)

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Comments : The scale includes four factors representing the principal dimensions of observable school behavior : cognitive competence, social compliance, motivational orientation and social competence.

16. Preschool Behavior Q Sort

Author : D. Baumrind.

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills p. 8

Variable : Interpersonal behaviors.

Type of M : Q sort.

Age : Preschool.

Comment : Eight constructs included high vs. low stress tolerance, self confident vs. fearful, achievement-oriented vs. withdrawn, autonomous vs. suggestible, rebelious vs. dependable with adults, destructive vs. constructive and alienated vs. trusting.

17. Preschool and Kindergarten Performance Profile

Authors : Dr. Nold, B. P. Kaminsky, A. E. Sternfeld.

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills (1971, p. 8)

Variable : Classroom behavior.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Comment : Social (Interpersonal relations), Emotional Behavior and Safety, and Intellectual and Physical Areas are included.

18. Childhood Personality Scales

Authors : D. Cohen and E. Dibble

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills (1971, p. 3)

Variable : Behavior categories.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 1 - 8 years

Comment : Statements are scaled according to the frequency with which a given child exhibits a specific behavior. Covers 24 behavior categories consisting of socially desirable and undesirable characteristics.

19. Ring and Peg Tests of Behavior Development

Author : K. M. Banhaim

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills (1977, p. 9)

Variable : Cognitive processes, social cooperation, personal independence, interest, drive and purpose, perceptual-motor and ideational skills.

Age : Birth - 6 years.

Type of M : Rating scale.

20. Student Evaluation Scale (SES)

Authors : W. T. Martin and S. Martin.

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Social Skills (1977, p. 10)

Variable : Educational and social-emotional responses to the school.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : Grades 1-12.

Comment : Considered to be especially useful as a pre-, interim, and post-semester rating device.

b. Measures used primarily as screening devices oriented toward problem behaviors.

Such measures can be used to assess how Head Start is influencing more difficult children or problem aspects of development. However, the problems of labelling and misuse of information becomes even more pronounced with tests in this category. For this reason descriptions of tests will be kept shorter than in other sections with certain exceptions.

1. Behavior Problems Checklist

Authors : J. Feldhusen and J. R. Thurston

Source : Johnson (1976, p. 1166)

Variable : Socially approved and aggressive-disruptive classroom behavior.

Type of M : Checklist.

Age : Elementary - High School

2. A-M-L Behavior Rating Scale

Author : P.P. Van Vleet.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 541-542)

Variable : Classroom behavior and learning symptoms.

Type of M : Rating scale .

Age : Presechool - H. S.

3. Scale for Rating Pupil Development- Kindergarten and 1st Grade Level (SRPD)

Author : J. S. Renzulli

Source : Johnson : (1976, pp. 129-130)

Variable : Developmental learning skills; social and emotional development.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 5 - 7 years.

Comments : Measures traits and levels of performance that are expressed in terms of observable and relatively unambiguous behaviors. Scale was designed for purposes of diagnosis and evaluation of remediation. Part II deals with five areas of social and four areas of emotional development, i.e. observing, listening, manipulating, socializing, communicating, interaction with others, developing favorable interests and attitudes toward school. (See Area V, D.)
Scale based on research studie in child psychology that deal with developmental tasks of primary grade children.

4. Behavior Checklist

Author : E. Rubin.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 542-543)

Variable : Behavioral adjustment in the classroom.

Type of M : Checklist.

Age : Elementary.

5. Preschool Behavior Questionnaire

Authors : L. Behar and S. Stungfield.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 563-565)

Variable : Behavior patterns.

Type of M : Rating scale .

Age : 3 - 6 years.

6. Wray Behavior Scale

Author : G. A. Wray

Source : Head Start Test Collection
Measures of Social Skills (1977, p. 11, ED002096)

Variable : 15 behavior symptoms.

Type of M : Rating scale .

Age : 3 - 8 years.

7. School Behavior Profile

Authors : B. Balor and R. A Dubin

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 572-573)

Variable : Problem behavior, personal adjustment.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : 5 - 18 years.

8. Pupil Behavior Inventory (PBI)
   Early Education Version

   Authors : R. Sarri and M. Radin

   Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 567-568)

   Variable : Behavior in class setting.

   Type of M : Rating scale.

   Age : 3 - 8 years.

9. Detroit Adjustment Inventory - Delta Form ;
   Telling What I Do

   Author : M. J. Baker

   Source : Guthrie (1971, p. 7)

   Variables : Habits, social, emotional, ethical adjustment in areas of self, school, community and home.

   Type of M : Questionnaire - Rating scale.

   Age : 5 - 8

10. Child Behavior Rating Scale

    Author : R. N Cassel

    Source : Guthrie (1971, p. 9)

    Variable : Behaviors, attitudes, attributes, status of children or parents (areas included are self, home, social, school physical adjustment and global adjustment).

    Type of M : Rating scale.

    Age : K - 3rd grade.

11. Hurewitz Quick Scoring Behavior Rating Scale

Author : P. Hurewitz

Source : Johnson (1976, pp.556-557)

Variables : Social habits, relationship with adults, parents, work habits and achievement etc.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : Pre K. to College.

c. Observation Instruments for Assessment of Classroom Behavior.

Observation Scales gives additional information not obtainable from rating scales. 1. Information if more objective, 2. concrete referents are given for what is meant by trait descriptions, 3. in some, means are given for determining the responsiveness in teachers' judgements to variations in behavior, 4. also in some it is shown how the child's behavior varies in response to teacher's response. (See Bronson, 1975, and Raizen et. al., 1974 for discussion.) In particular, it might be noted that problems of ethnic and racial biases could be less pronounced with use of these types of measures. It is the best way for assessing the child-teacher interaction i.e., relationship of child to adult-authority figure.

1. Apple Observation System

Authors : N.M. Lambert, C.S. Harkough and B.C. Moore.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1163-1164)

Variable : Noncognitive classroom behavior.

Type of M : Observation system.

Age : School-age children.

Comments : Events in the Apple are sentances describing the behavior of a child. They focus on what the child is observed to do, the antecendent conditions producing the observed behavior (italics ours), the teacher response to the child (if any) and the learning context of the observed behavior.

2. Emmerich Classroom Observation Rating Scale

Author : W. Emmerich

Source : Walker (1973, pp. 177-178)

Variable : Personal-social behaviors.

Type of M : Observation rating scale

Age : Preschool to kindergarten.

Comment : Ratings made on 127 unipolar and 21 bipolar scales. Rating steps were based on frequency of behavior with four steps for unipolar and seven steps for bipolar scales. Examples of bipolar behaviors rated are withdrawn-involved, rebellious-compliant, active-passive, and solitary-social. This system

was developed for use in the ETS Head Start Longitudinal Study. Emmerich (1971) concludes that personal-social behaviors of predominantly black lower class children can be mapped successfully into a three space defined by a circumplez ordering together with the dimension of task vs. person-orientation. This ordering of constructs suggested a developmental model of personality change for educationally disadvantaged children.

See : Emmerich, W. Structure and Change in the behavior of economically disadvantaged preschool children. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association. (Washington DC, March 30 - A pril 3, 1975)
ED 110488 TM 004761

See also : Observer Ratings of Children

Authors : W. Emmerich and G. Wilder

Source : Coller (1971) p. 24

Variables : Described as a measure of "personal-social constructs."

3. Ogilvie & Shapiro (1972)

See Raizenet et al. (1974, pp/ 176-178) for an extensive discussion of this system.

4. Case Study Method

Author : D. A. Prescott

Source : Walker (1973, p. 76)

Variable : Socioemotional adjustment.

Type Of M : Observational technique.

Age : Preschool to K.

Comment : Method used in Head Start Planned Variation Study (1969-1972) to assess socioemotional development of individual children.

5. Stanford Research Instrument

Author : J. Stallings

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1214-1215)

Variable : Classroom instructional process and child behaviors.

Type of M : Interactive observation, checklist, inventory.

Age : 3-12 years.

Comment : A very extensive, detailed instrument.

6. Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings (CASES)

Author : R. L. Spaulding

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 547-549)

Variable : Classroom behavior

Type of M : Behavior category system.

Age : Preschool through H. S.

Comment : " Designed to measure the process of normal personality development and socialization occuring in the school environment. Categories based on behavioralization of ego psychological theory. The system was augmented to include references to the values and goals of the classroom teacher or the school authority in charge." 8 coping styles identified : aggressive-manipulative, non-conforming-resistant, withdrawn , distractible, adult dependant, socially integrative, self-directed - task oriented, other directed - conforming.

7. Behavior Ratings and Analysis of Communication in Education

Authors : G. W. Bowman & R. S. Mayer

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1167-1168)

Variable : Adult/Child verbal communication and behavior, characteristics of educational settings.

Type of M : Observational technique, behavior ratings and activity sampling.

Comments : Incorporates antecedents of behavior and patterns of child/adult communication. Can be used as a program evaluation instrument, to measure the impact of a given type of intervention on the behavior, language and activities of children. Part of the instrument (ACE) was developed for Bank Streets Follow Through Program, 1970 and has been re-

fined through the years. The other part (BORIS) was used in comparing Follow Through sponsors in a study conducted for Harvard University.

8. No Name Given

Authors : A. Karlson & S. Stodolsky

Source : ED128426 TM005611 (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the A ERA, New Orleans, Louisiana, Feb. 1973)

Variable : Patterns of work and play.

Type of M : Observational technique.

Comments : Used to measure program effects in a private urban school serving racially heterogeneous population (both Head Start and middle class children were included in the program).

9. Interaction Analysis

Authors : S. Falsey & B. Ramsey

Source : ED128090, PS008782

Variable : Classroom behavior

Type of M : Observational technique

Comments : Used in assessment of the DARCEE Head Start preschool program. Information pertaining to task orientation, verbal content, and use of props within an interaction, modality and affect of imitation and respondent were measured. Child - child, child - teacher , teacher - child behavior recorded. " the use of interaction analysis appeared to be successful in achieving the goal, providing systematic assessment of the application of specific DARCEE principles in the classroom. "

10. Observation Schedule and Record

Authors : D Medley & H. Mitzel

Source : Journal of Educational Psychology (1958, 49, 86-92)
also Taylor (1975)

Comment : A technique for measuring behavior.

11. Teacher Practices Observation Record

See Soar & Soar (1972) in Taylor (1975)

12. Discrete Classroom Behaviors Schedule

Author : J. A. Cobb

Source : Coller (1971)

Variable : Academically appropriate and inappropriate actions.

Type of M : Observation technique.

Age : Not indicated but appears useful for observing the young child.

Comment : Categories are : attending, appropriate talking with teacher, noncompliance, appropriate talk with peer, inappropriate talk with teacher or peer, volunteers, imitation, complies, self-stimulation, physical negative, destructiveness, inappropriate locale, noisy, play.

13. School and Classroom Observation Categories

Authors : J. I. Goodlad, M. F. Klein, & Associates.

Source : Coller (1971, p.29)

Variable : Classroom behavior

Type of M : Uses anecdotal records, an observation technique.

Age : K - Third grade.

Comments : Some of the categories included are : milieu, instructional activities, subject matter, materials and equipment, involvement, interaction, inquir, independence, curriculum balance, curricular adaptation.

14. Weekly Ratings

Author : National Institute of Mental Health

Variables : Chronic fear, fear when using equipment, frenetic-impulsive, impatience, positive peer interaction, negative peer interaction, originality, nurturance, female teacher & male teacher, indication of intervention, interest in obtaining help, seeking help.

Type of M : Observation technique.

Age : Preschool.

Comments : Some items on this scale aren't generalizable to other settings.

15. Reaction to Entry of Teachers

Author : National Institute of Mental Health

Source : Coller (1971, p. 28)

Variables : Child's reactions as teacher enters doorway and attempts

4. Child-Task Interaction Styles

Child-Task Interaction Styles refers to the way those aspects of the manner in which the child relates to a task which are not directly identified with his/her knowledge of the material or the intellectual-cognitive content of the task, but do directly influence performance level and consequently academic success.

A. Direction Following : The ability to understand and follow directions (Shipman in Raizen et al. 1974, p. 193)

1. Preschool Language Scale

Author : Title III ESEA Early Prevention of School Failure Project Staff Peotone, Ill.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 204-205)

Variable : School readiness of integrated auditory and visual perceptual modalities.

Type of Measure : Individual diagnostic test.

Age : 2-9 years, emphasis on 4 1/2 - 6 years.

2. Preschool Rating Scale

Authors : W. F. Barker, L. Sandler, A Bornemann and G. Knight

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 114-115)

Variable : Personal-social development.

Type of M : Rating scale (Guttman).

Comment : Has section on individual instructions.

3. Pre Kindergarten Scale

Author : T. M. Flynn

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 112-113)

Variable : Cognitive skills, self control, relationship with achievement model, dependency.

Type of M : Obserever rating scale.

Age : 3-5 years

Comment : Has part of a section on ability to follow instructions.

4. D. Wood and J. Bruner

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, p. 195)

Variable : Ability to master task using available self-directive cues.

Comment : Test requires adaptation (see Raizen et al.).

B. Task Completion and Attention Control

The ability to focus one's attention on the task at hand and to carry it out until completion. See Anderson and Messick, 1973. "control of attention" and "independent learning behavior" (Simon & Boyer, 1970 in Rentfrow, 1975) and Collins (1977) "control of attention in focusing on the cognitive demands of a particular situation" (p. 232).

1. D. Wood & J. Brunner (cited in Bronson, 1973)

   See section on Direction Following (IV A-#4)- Raizen et al. (1974)

2. Primary Auditory Screening Test

   Authors : B. A. Plummer, S. Harris, P. Marcus, J. Rupert.

   Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 928-929)

   Variable : Auditory Processing.

   Type of M : Tape-recorded test.

   Age : 6-8 years.

   Comment : Has section measuring ability to identify a stimulus phrase within a background of two semantic distractions.

3. Classroom Attitude Observation Schedule (CAOS)

   Author : R. K. Rentfrow (1975)

   Source : ED118870 & 073837

   Variable : Development of independent learning style.

   Type of M : Observation scale.

   Age : Preschool - grade three.

4. Block & Block Test Battery (1972)

   Source : Raizen et al. (1974, p. 194)

   Variable : Ability to focus on two tasks simultaneously, attention to storytelling and clicks.

   Type of M : Individual task.

5. High/Scope Pupil Observation Checklist

Source : Collins (1977, p. 232)

6. Intensity of Involvement Scale

Authors : W. L. Hodges & B. R. McCandless

Variable : Degree of Task Involvement.

Type of M : Rating scale.

Age : Unlimited.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 342-343)

Comment : Seven categories of behavior ranging from unoccupied to complete involvement.

C. Test-Taking Behavior and Ability

The affective and style components of test variance.

1. Behavior Rating Scale

Author : University City School district Mo.

Source : ED043685

Variable : Independence, concentraction, tractibility, attitude disposition toward test-taking.

Type of M : Rating scale (0-4).

Age :

2. Circus No. 16 : Inventory of Test Taking Behavior

Author : Available from ETS, 1974.

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, p. 143 & p. 189)

Variable : Degree to which child asks for help, reluctance to work, enjoyment of content, desire to stop, does not answer, question, random response, care in weighing alternatives, engages in irrelevancies.

Type of M : Observation and/or rating scale.

Age : Preprimary.

Comment : Ratings may be made seperately for each task, for a representative selection of tasks or globally for the battery as a whole.

Other measures of a child's task involvement may be extracted from Classroom behavior observation or rating scales (Area III & for example, Area I, A, b. 4).

3. Hertzig-Birch Scoring of Stanford-Binet IQ Test

Authors : Hertzig & Birch.

Source : Collins : (1977, p. 234)

Variable : Test-taking behavior.

Type of M :

Age : Preschool.

D. Reflectivity

" The child's tendency to 'stop and think' and to evaluate the available information and to consider alternative hypotheses prior to making a decision." Collins (1977, p. 231)

1. Matching Familiar Figures Test

Author : M. Lewis.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 350-351)

Variable : Impulsivity and reflectivity.

Type of M : Test.

Age : 36-70 months.

Comment : See also Collins (1977, p. 231)

2. Kansas Reflection-Impulsivity Scale for Preschoolers

Author : J. C. Wright.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 346-347)

Variable : Reflection-impulsivity.

Type of M : Test.

Age : Approximately 3-5½ years.

Comment : Used to identify extremes. Predictive validity not established.

E. Creativity

" Child's capacity to generate novel or original approaches and to apply these skills to games, problems and a wide variety of intellectual situations. " Collins (1977, p. 232). We would add to this the child's inclination or disposition to generate novel approaches.

1. Prescott Day Care Environmental Inventory

Author :

Source : Collins (1977) p. 233

2. Wallach (1970)

Source : Collins (1977, p. 233) See also Wallach & Kogan in Johnson (1976, pp. 341-342). Measure of ideational fluency which might be adapted for younger children.

3. Creative-Response Matrices Test

Author : P. E. Vernon.

Source : Johnson (1976, p. 67)

Variable : Nonverbal intelligence "g".

Type of M : Test.

Age : 8-12 Years.

Comment : Would need to be adapted for younger children. It's present form was adapted for use with " culturally deprived and test-unsophisticated children ".

4. Creative Attitude Survey

Author : C. E. Schaefer.

Source : Johnson (1976, p. 329)

Variable : Attitudinal aspects of creativity.

Type of M : Questionnaire.

Age : 8-12 years.

Comment : Would need to be adapted for use with younger children. Item construction was based on review of the literature for the characteristics, attitudes, beliefs and values of highly creative persons.

5. Classroom Creativity Observation Schedule

Author : D. A. Denny.

Source : Johnson (1976, p. 319)

Variable : Classroom teacher behaviors fostering creativity.

Age : K - 9 years.

Type of M : Observation schedule.

Comment : This might be a worthwhile addition to measures of child creativity i.e., opportunity to assess relationship of H.S. child creativity to the behaviors of the classroom teacher.

F. Goal Setting

a) What is the child's learning goal for self on a particular task? b) What is his/her minimum achievement level and success expectancy? c) How does he/she reward self in relation to performance. Based on definition of "achievement behavior" proposed by Crandall et al. (1962) and summarized in Raizen et al. (1974) as follows: "Achievement behavior is behavior directed to attain (avoid) the approval (disapproval) related to competent (incompetent) performance in situations where standards of excellence are applicable. So regarded, achievement behavior is related to the value children attache to intellectual competence, as well as to success expectancy and self-evaluation standards. This achievement behavior is an outcome centrally involved in a group of constructs, all of which have been regarded both as important for school success and as differentiating higher from lower-status children. (p. 196)

1. Crandall et al. (1962) & Weiner (1972)

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 197-199)

Variables : Goal setting and self evaluation behaviors.

Type of M : Child selection of task and self-nurturing predictions and functioning and level of self reward.

Comment : Raizen et al. suggest adaptation of the above mentioned behavior tasks.

2. Children's Achievement Motivation Scale

Author : B. Weiner.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 464-466)

Variable : Achievement motivation.

Type of M : Forced choice questionnaire.

Age : 6-14 years.

Comments : Would need adaptation for younger children. Might provide useful self report information to supplement the more task specific achievement behavior tackled in #1 and academic self concept (I,B.). Heavy verbal requirements might pose a problem for population under study.

3. Weiner (1972)

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 198-199)

Variable : Attribution, self reward behavior under contitions of effort vs. luck attributions.

Type of M : Test and self rating.

4. Nicholls, J. G.

Source : Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, (3), 379-389.

Variable : Attribution (ability, luck, effort, task difficulty).

Type of M : Test and self report.

Comment : Attributions were measured using a device such as a pie graph which students could adjust to show the relative importance

of the four possible causes of their score. Use as a behavioral task-specific concomitant of Locus of Control Self-Concept Report (I-C).

G. Curiosity and Competence Motivation

" The foundation of exploratory or epistemic behavior stimulated by situations involving a combination of the novel and the familiar and is thus related to the desire to find out something for its own noninstrumental interest value." Raizen et al. (1974, p. 202) summarizing Berlyne (1960).

1. Prescott's Day Care Environmental Inventory

Source : Collins (1977, p. 231)

2. Measures patterned after the "curiosity box" used in the Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery Banta (1970). These are discussed in Raizen et al. (1974, p. 203)

Comment : Of Questionable relevance to school.

3. About Myself Scale

Authors : W. H Man & E. W. Main

Variable : Curiosity.

Type of M : Rating scale .

Source : Johnson : (1976, pp. 351-352)

Age : Grades 4-6.

Comment : Adapt for use as teacher rating scale for younger children as compared to self rating. See adaptation recommended by Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 203-204).

4. Cognitive Orientation Questionnaire of Curiosity

Authors : S. Kertler & H. Kertler

Source : Johnson (1976 , pp. 321-322)

Variable : Cognitive contents (norms, goals, beliefs) concerning curiosity and its manifestations.

Type of M : Questionnaire.

Age : 4-8 years.

Comment : Possibly productive addition to curiosity measures indicating attitudes, beliefs about self and goals which would orient child toward manifestation of more or less curious behavior.

H. Intentional-Incidental Learning Cues and Reinforcement Style

a) The ability of the child to intentionally attend to learning cues as compared with acquiring responses incidental to the learning task.

b) Relative importance of intrinsic, social and tangible reinforcements.

Raizen et al. (1974) provide a fine discussion of and ways of measuring these behaviors (pp. 199-202).

An additional test is the following :

1. Children's Reinforcement Survey Schedule (CRSS)

Authors : J. R. Cautela & L Meisels

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 471-473)

Variable : Reinforcing stimuli and their relative reinfocement values.

Type of M : Likert-type scale.

Age : Forms A&B K - Grade three, Form C - Grades 4 - 6.

I. Responce Range

Resourcefulness in response to situational stimuli (resiliency) varying in degrees of frustration and in amount of structure.

1. Zigler and de Labry (1962)

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 216-217)

Variable : Ability to switch concepts.

Type of M : Sorting task.

Comment : Structured nonfrustrating situations.

2. Block & Block (1972) Test Battery

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 217-218)

Variable : Ability to produce multiple solutions.

Type of M : Object-sorting task, parent teaching strategies, "divergent thinking" tasks.

Comment : Unstructured, nonfrustrating situations.

3. Block & Block (1972)

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, pp. 218-219)

Variable : Barrier behavior.

Type of M : "Stuck drawer" task.

Comment : Frustrating, structured task.

J. Non - Social Executive Skill

Bronson's (1975) global dimension of non-social executive skill (i.e. skill in choosing and coping with tasks) encompasses some of the areas previously included under the area of task behavior, but incorporates some additional valuable dimensions which are frequently considered part of metacognitive style (Collins, 1977, pp. 233 ff. and Raizen at al. 1974, p.127). Let us consider Bronson's definition of non-social executive skill, " It requires the ability to select rasks appropriate to one's level of skill (cf. F), to organize task-relevant materials, to use effective coping strategies, to resist distraction (cf. B), to notice errors and to correct them or to effectively summon help, to try repeatedly (persist) when necessary (B) and ultimately to reach a chosen goal successfully (cf. B)."

1. Executive Competence in Preschool Children

Author : M. B. Bronson

Source : PS007906, ED, 107378

Variable : Non-social executive skill.

Type of M ; Classroom observation technique.

Age : 3-6, with pilot work done with first and second graders.

Comment : Non-social executive skill is operationally defined by the following behavioal categories : coping strategies, tasks tried, notice novelty and discrepancy, distracted, corrects errors, tries again, tries again successfully, dual focus, gives up, asks for help.

2. Learning Behavior Guide

Author : D. H Stott.

Variable : Behavior of the child in a learning situation.

Type of M : Checklist.

Age : 5-10 years.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 347-348)

Comment : This measure is designed to assess what we might call lack of non-social executive skill. It is designed for identification of students who are not making use of their potential because of inappropriate learning strategies, eg. fear of committing self to an answer.

L. Other

a) One other aspect of child task interaction styles worth mentioning is child responsiveness to peer vs. adult reinforcement and response. b) The following is a test which covers many of the above areas :

1. Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery

Author : T. J. Banta - Prof. of Psychology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Source : Guthrie (1971)

Variables : Curiosity, innovative behavior, impulse control, reflectivity, incidental learning, intentional learning, persistance, resistance

to distraction, field independence, task competence, curiosity, verbalization (also includes social competency, fantasy-related varbalization and kindergarten prognosis).

Type of M : Test (individual administration).

Age : 3-6.

Comment : Includes much of what we have labelled task behavior , IV B, C, D, G and H. Perhaps an effective way to assess behavior in these areas.

5. School Attitudes

It has been generally accepted that attitude toward school is a powerful mediator of school success (Collins, 1974). This general statement may perhaps be tempered by Anderson and Messick's (1974) observation that "While it is not realistic - or perhaps even functional -- to expect every child to like all aspects of education and learning, he should have positive feelings toward some aspects and not reject the total process." In accord with this approach we suggest an attempt be made to measure not only the child's feelings toward school in general, but toward more specific aspects of school i.e., teacher, school evnironment, peers and tasks.

Furthermore, there is another aspect of the child's attitude toward school, beyond his affection for it, which mediates academic success. The importance the child attaches to school and intellectual pursuits will influence his/her degree of openness to learning.

A. Child's attitude toward school including teacher, school environment, peers and tasks.

1. Primary Academic Sentiment Scale

Author : G. R. Thompson.

Source : Walker (1973, p. 147)

Variable : Child's preferred activities, attitudes and behaviors, and primarily activities and behaviors.

Type of M : Self-report inventory.

Age : 4 - 7 years.

Comment : Special instructions for educationally disadvantaged provided. Reliability rated as poor and validity as fair. Raizen et al. propose adjustments in test to improve reliability.

2. Oral School Attitude Scale

Author : J. Rivera.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1014-1015)

Variable : Attitude toward school environment and educational experience.

Age : K - third grade.

Comments : Reliability data obtained by administering test to children representing varios ethnic and socioeconomic groups. Instructions are provided in English and Spanish. Probably could be revised for use with younger children.

3. School Attitude Survey

Author : H. F. Burks.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1030-1031)

Variable : Feelings of children about the things they learn, their teacher, other children and the learning environment.

Type of M : Questionnaire.

Age : Elementary school.

Comments : Probably could be revised for younger children. Items were judged by teachers according to the following criteria : understandibility to elementary school age children, pertinance to school activities, relationship to some school condition or situation that could be changed, nonduplication of items and absence of potential to embarrass the child.

4. School Sentiment Index

Author : Instructional Objectives Exchange.

Source : Johnson (1976, pp. 1032-1034)

Variable : Attitude toward teacher, school subjects, school social structure and climate, peers and general activity.

Type of M : Self-report inventory.

Age : K - Grade 12.

Comments : Not all sections of equal reliability at Primary ages eg., attitude toward peers appears to have low internal consistency and stability reliability.

5. Minuchin's Sentence Completion

Author : S. Minuchin et al.

Source : Raizen et al. (1974, p. 226)

Variable : School attitudes.

Type of M : Sentence completion test.

Age : Third grade +

Comment : Sentence completions rated on four point scale (negative, ambivalent, conforming and identification).

6. Children's Attitudinal Range Indicator

Authors : V. G. Cicirelli, W. H. Cooper, R. L. Granger - Westinghouse Learning Corp.

Source : Head Start Test Collection Reports Measures of Social Skills.

Variables : Child's positive and negative or neutral attitudes toward peers, home, school and society.

Type of M : Projective non verbal sentance competion.

Age : 5 - 9.

Comments : Has been particularly useful with young and "disadvantaged" children. Provides a basis for contrasting child's attitudes toward school with his attitudes toward other aspects of his life i.e. Is this a child who is generally negativistic or are his/her feelings particularly negative or positive toward school ?

7. See Also Perception Score Sheet as described Area I, Dimension A

8. Pictorial Measure of School-Related Attitudes

Author : S. B. Khan.

Source : Johnson (1976, p. 1016)

Variable : Attitudes toward school and teacher.

Type of M : Pictorial situations.

Age : Eight years and up.

Comments : The nature of the materials would lend themselves to use with younger children. The instrument is still in the development stage.

9. Sechrest's Structured Interview Schedule

Author: L. B. Sechrest

Source: Walker (1973, p. 58)

Variable: Attitudes toward classroom teacher.

Type of M: Situational structured interview (open ended questions).

Age: K-3rd grade

10. High/Scope School Attitude Interview

Author: Lone et al

Source: Collins (1977, p. 270)

Variable: Child's feelings about being in school, the way child responds to teacher, how child view the teachers feeling about him or herself.

Type of M: Interview, forced choice.

Age:

B) Importance of School to Child

11. Children's Achievement Wishes Test

Authors: V. Crandall et al

Source: Raizen et al (1974, p. 227)

Variable: Value child attaches to intellectual competence.

Type of M; Self report inventory - forced choice.

Age: 1st grade +

Comments: Test used with children of varying socio-economic backgrounds. Raizen et all question use of forced choice.

2. Self Observation Scales: Primary

Author : A. J. Stenner and W. G. Katzenmeyer

Source : Head Start Collection Reports. National Testing Service. Test for Spanish speaking children, p. 7.

Variable : 5 dimensions of self-concept including achievement motivation and school appreciation.

Type of M :

Ages : K-Grade 3

Comment : Spanish version of test available. Includes a variety of aspects of self-concept -- designed to measure way children perceive selves and relationships to peers, teachers, and school.

3. What Face Would You Wear

Authors : G. A. Farrah, N. J. Milchus and W. Reitz

Source : Walker (1973, p. 249)

Variable : School role expectation. Achievement needs, failure avoidance, and self adequacy.

Age : Pre-school - K; two forms for elementary and H.S. are also available.

Type of M : Self-report, semiprojective inventory.

C) Parental Assessment of Child's Attitudes Toward School

This measure would provide opportunity for information regarding the degree of congruence between the child's expressed attitudes toward school and parent's perception of these attitudes, i.e. How in tune is parent with child's feelings toward school? How much of his/her perception reflects the parents own attitudes toward the child's school experience? (see VI D).

It would also provide some additional behavioral data regarding the child's school attitudes which would be used to suppliment the interview data obtained in Area V A.

1. As recommened by Raizen et al (1974, pp. 180-181) parent summary estimates could be obtained on:

a) The child's overall happiness with the school situation.

b) The child's reluctance to leave home for school.

c) Assessment of the importance of the student role to the child, possibly in contrast to other roles.

D) Teacher Assessment of Child's Attitude Toward School

This measure would provide the opportunity to obtain information regarding congruence between the child's expressed attitudes toward school and teacher's perception of these attitudes. Congruence on this dimension is important for two reasons:

1) It indicates how well the child's feelings are "getting through to the teacher."

2) Teacher's perceptions of child's attitudes toward school would be expected to contribute to the way in which the teacher responds to the child. In other words, such information might provide clues into the nature of a positive or negative "vicious circle" that might be functioning regarding child's school attitudes and teacher's perceptions of these attitudes.

1) As recommended by Raizen et al (1974, p. 174) teacher summary estimates could be obtained which parallel the parents summary estimates. However, use of a system ranking children in relation to others in the class would nullify comparisons between parent and teacher estimates. Estimates could be obtained on:

a) Child's overall happiness with the school situation.

b) Assessment of the importance of the student role to the child.

2) Student Role Behavior Scale

Author: . Weinstein

Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 577-578)

Variable: Teacher's assessments of social and achievement-related behavior.

Type of M: Rating Scale

Age: Elementary school, but no reason why it could not be employed with teachers of younger children.

Comment: This test gives more than teacher's perception of child's attitude toward school, it gives teacher's ratings of general classroom behavior. It is interesting to note that a validity study showed that this scale correlated .86 with the sum of teacher's ratings of the child on 5 items relating to the extent the child's school achievement measured up to his potential for learning, the child's disruptiveness in class, his feelings of personal distress, his ability to face new or difficult situations and his relationships with his classmates.

3) Scale for Rating Pupil Development - Kindergarten and First-Grade Level

Author: J. S. Renzulli

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 129)

Variables: Developmental learning skills; social and emotional development.

Type of M: Rating Scale

Comments: Items in Part II (social-emotional development deal with among other areas, development of favorable interests and attitudes toward school.) This is a comprehensive test that includes in Part I 7 basic learning skills that children of this age should be able to master. Part II, the socioemotional section, includes 9 areas, among which are: observing, listening, manipulating, socializing, communicating, interacting with others. The comprehensiveness of the test possibly would make it a positive contribution to the study. Particularly since it is based on experical research studies in child psychology. Its applicability to our population must be researched.

6. Home and Parents

Collins (1977) in a summary of key current assessments points out that parents are the most important influence on the young child's early education and development.

A) Parents' Role Expectations for Their Child

Washington (1975) presents a useful paradigm to illustrate the 3 subsystems whose value orientations influence the goals and success definitions of Head Start; these are the donor subsystem, the service delivery system and the recipient subsystem comprised of children and parents who participate in Head Start. According to Washington, "any attempt to measure the impact of Head Start as a national program must take into account the value orientations of members of all three systems" (p. 83).

This paradigm raises the interesting possibility of assessing not only parents and teachers, student and child role concepts but those of officials in the "donor" subsystem, ie., administrators using the same test as a basis for obtaining a consensus upon which significant dimensions of personality to focus.

Investigating parents'child role concepts and their assessment of how their child is measuring up to these conceptions is of value in the following ways:

1. Such information provides input which will help to evaluate the effects of Head Start.
2. Exposes sources of possible role conflict and or role integration for the child ie., gives insight as to the nature of the child's experiences in being both Head Start student and son or daughter in his/her home environment.

3. A comparison of parent's, teachers and the child's own role conceptions would be helpful in this regard. Also useful might be to note the relationship between degree of consonance among these role conceptions and the various aspects of self-concept of the child (I) and the child's attitude toward school(V) will help to evaluate the degree of influence of Head Start on parents expectations, through pre-and post-measures.

4. Enables us to look at the degree of similarity and differences between Head Start parents'and teachers'expectations based on region and ethnic back grounds ie., to identify areas of greatest potential conflict and accord and their effects on the child.

Words of caution in measurement in this area have been issued by many. Collins (1977) observes that "theory and measures development are still primitive, testing and observations outside the classroom are expensive, unobtrusive and sensitive assessment remains more an art than a science and child advocacy groups are apprehensive in the light of the sorry policy uses of evaluation results when decisionmakers read more into the findings than the data will support. Overcoming these obstacles will not be easy, but the attempt must be made in the long run interest of designing better programs for children." (pp. 272-273)

a)Parents'Role Expectations for Child as Student

1. Kelly's (1955) Role Construct Reportory Test

Raizen et al (1974. p. 179) recommend adaptation of this test to obtain parent generated constructs of the competent or well-developed student. By asking the parents to supply item content in their own terminology, language-culture bias problems of interviewing parents of low SES children using standardized instruments are attenuated. The consideration these authors give with respect to problems in the use of evaluative terms is important. (p. 182) Determining the extent to which the characterization have positive or negative connotations for parents (for teachers) by use of Osgood's Semantic Differential would help to interpret the evaluative data.

b) Parent Role Expectations for their Child in General

In addition to parent's perceptions of the student role, it would be important to obtain information on general expecatations and values implicit in parental conceptions of the role of the child and the relationship of these to parental conceptions of the child as student. These would be thought to be a significant factor in the issue of child level and type of role integration or role conflict. For example, if parent felt positively about noisiness at home and negatively about this behavior in school it might present a discrimination problem for the child which results in conflict.

1) Field Guide For the Study of Aspects of Subjective Culture

Authors: H. C. Triardis and R. S. Malpass

Source: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Urbania, IL 61801

Comment: This paper is a field guide presenting techniques and methods for the analysis of various aspects of subjective culture. ("a human group's characteristic way of perceiving the man-made part of its environment. It includes the group's model, attitudes, norms, roles and values. p. 1).

B) Observer's Ratings of Child's Behavior at Home

The ratings of the child's behavior at home will give a broader perspective on the impact of Head Start on the child; positive results in terms of evidence of emotional growth or negative results as a possible result of excessive role conflict. The specific aspects of the child's behavior change will also be a significant consideration.

1) Measures should be chosen after the data obtained from parents' responses to the Kelley Role Construct Repertory Test are analyzed - so that the aspects of behavior which are measured are those thought to be important by parents. Perhaps a more observational type measure would be useful in lessening the effects of biases. Use of parents as observers might be reconsidered if the combination of the clarification of communication resulting from the process of obtaining the Role Construct Information and the selection of a test which is in accord with parents' own conceptions and values might make this possible. The following measures have been used to rate childrens behavior in the home:

1) Child Behavior Checklist

Author: R. N. Walker

Source: Johnson (1976; p. 408)

Variables: Eight temparement variables

Type of M: Rating scale (in checklist form)

Age:

Parents of preschool children comment: Would need to be adapted for use and by observers rather than parents and with older children.

It is interesting to note that tests of validity indicated that teacher's and parent's views showed little similarity. As Johnson asks, perhaps this is because children behaved differently at home and at school.

The eight variables considered are as follows: energetic-active, curious, thoughtful, agreesive-assertive, fearful-anxious, social-friendly, excitable-tense, cooperative-confirming, cheerful-pressive.

2) Scoring System for Home & School

Authors: M. E. Bernal & J. A. North

Source: Johnson (1976 pp. 1203-1204)

Variable: Behavior in home or school classroom

Type of M: Behavioral coding system.

Age: 4 - 10 years

Comments: 4 major behavior categories are included; compliance-non-compliance, annoying, deviant, and desirable behavior. The scoring system includes codes suitable for identification of children who are low in compliance and high in acting out behaviors. Importantly it yields information regarding the consequences produced by the child's acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and allows for comparison between the home and school.

3) Scale for Parent's Rating

Author: R. N. Walker

Source: Johnson (1976 pp. 524-525)

Variables: 10 temparement traits in children as judged by their parents

Type of M: Q-Sort

Age: Parents of school-aged children

Comments: Would need to be revised for use with non-parent observers. Traits measured are energy, surgency, socialness, stability, aggressiveness, dominance, competitence, activity and control scores are also derived.

4) Home Behavior Inventory

Author: E. S. Schaefer and M. Aaronson

Source: Head Start Test Collection

Measures of Social Skills, p. 6

Variables: 6 categories of child behavior at home

Type of M: Inventory

Age: Preschool

Comments: Categories are extraversion, task-oriented behavior, introversion, hostility, distractibility, and considerateness. Frequency of behavior is rated.

5) Preprimary Profile: Introduction to My Child

Authors: H. J. Schiff & M. I. Friedman

Source: Guthrie (1971) p.21

Variable: Nature and interests of children including self-care, social behavior, skill development, language development, and previous experience.

Age: Parent of Child entering school for first time

Comment: Instrument is used to assess development of child after first period in school through test - retest.

6) Childhood Personality Scales

See III, B, A, 18.

7) Child's Behavior Traits (for observer not parent rating)

Author: P. Levenstein et al. Verbal Interaction Projects

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 415-416)

Variable: Some emotional development

Type of M: Likert-Type Scale

Age: 2 - 12 years

Comments: Used with low-income children can be used for teacher ratings III B.

C) Parent Expectations for Child's Academic Success

The function of self-fulfilling prophecy in depressing academic achievement of black and other minority child has often been considered. Since parents are known to have much influence on the academic strivings of their children, parent expectations for child's academic success would be expected to influence the degree of actual success.

It might be recommended that very early in the program parents be asked to estimate their child's academic potential - to hazard guesses as to future level of academic success. The relative realism of the parents expectations can be assessed by examining actual school performance, the results of tests in the Cognitive Domain, and an assessment of child-task, behaviors, and teacher estimates of the child's potential. Asking parents, as Raizen et al. (1974) propose to estimate their child's academic potential relative to his/her classmates and comparing these estimates with child's achievement level might not expose situations in which parents low expectations are already artificially depressing the child's achievement level. A broader range of indicators of potential is needed.

D) Parent Involvement in School

Collins (1977) discusses the importance of parent participation "As a mechanism for fostering continuity between the home and the school", (p. 268). He quotes Comer & Poussaint (1975) who point to the presence and interest of the parents as giving a stamp of approval to the staff and school work, enabling the child to identify with school work and school people. An assessment of parent involvement and the importance which parents attach to school success will provide data necessary for the evaluation of the degree of impact of parent involvement on the child and on the parent as evidenced for example in correlation with child's attitude and behavior measures. The relationship between geographical and ethnic backgrounds and parent involvement would be considered to be a possibly important mediating variable which should be analyzed. We might mention that parent involvement might be thought to be an important mediator influencing congruity of parent and teacher role perceptions.

D.

a) Archival Data

The following list is based in large part on recommendations made by Raizen et al. (1974,p. 182) and Collins (1977 p. 267). Parent involvement can be measured by coding the following data.

1) Rate of PTA attendance
2) Frequency of volunteering to be room parent, aide, chauffeur, etc. or in other parts of the program.
3) Response to open house or parent teacher conference invitations
4) Involvement in or invitation of program activities for parents themselves.
5) Employment in the program.
6) Participation in decision making roles in the program.

D.

b) Importance of School Success to Parent

How central and significant is the child's school success (as defined by the parent) to the parent?

Parent involvement in the program gives one indication of this dimension. Another might be provided by interview-type information.

E) Parent Attitude Toward Child's School Experience

How parents feel about the child's current school experience would be thought to influence the child's attitudes toward school and possibly classroom behavior as well. (The reverse is probably also true).

Parental involvement in school and importance attached to schooling in general (VII, D) should be expected to correlate with this dimension.

1) Parent Opinion Survey

Author: F. Rhodes

Source: Johnson (1976, p. 1015)

Variable: Parental attitude toward child's school experience.

Type of M: Likert-type rating scale

Age: Parents of elementary school pupils K to Grade 6

Comment: The scale has been used to measure general parent satisfaction in evaluations of both regular and special education programs.

7. Child Social Role Perceptions and Integration

Hauser (1971) defined healthy psychosocial adjustment as the "integration of self-images and social-role-images over time in such a way as to allow for the fullest self development" or at least for an "adaptive self development" (see Raizen et al, 1974, p. 232). The school world introduces a new set of roles and requirements, to the child and his/her family particularly in the case of the minorities who have felt a greater sense of alienation from schools than the majority groups. To the extent that these roles are consonant with the norms of the sub-culture there will be little difficulty in role integration. Should, as is probable these new norms be different and opposed in some ways to those of the minority sub culture the child and his/her family must either restructure their orientations, maintain sets of situationally determined norms, or employ deviant adjustments to handle the unresolved dissonance. Since the manner in which the child resolves these conflicts will certainly and importantly influence his/her development, a look at both the child's perceptions of his/her role how he/she handles probable role conflicts arising out of the Head Start experience is crucial to understanding the effects of Head Start on the child's development.

A) Child's Perception of Teacher, Peer, Parent Expectations of Him/Her

In other sections we have outlined some aspects of the evaluation of the nature of the role demands ie., IIIA and VIA - comparisons of teacher's and parent's student role expectations. In this section we recommend examining the role demands from the child's point of view; ie., the child's discriminations of parent, teacher and peer expectations related to his/her roles as student, child and friend.

The following questions would be answered:

How does the child see his/her role of student in terms of both parent and teacher expectations?

How does the child see his/her role as child in terms of parent expectations?

How does the child view his/her role as friend in terms of peer expectations?

How do these perceptions dovetail? Where are the sources of conflict and stress from the child's point of view?

How do child perceptions relate to parent and teacher perceptions (VIIA and VIA)?

It would additionally be meaningful to assess the child's perceptions of the roles of adults ie., parents and teachers. Understanding and accuracy of perception of the role of the teacher can be a significant mediator of the child's school attitudes, and perception of the role of another plays a certain role in child development.

1) Social Value Acquisition Battery

Author: E. Scott

Source: Walker (1973, pp. 293-294)

Variable: Child's perceptions of cultural value expectations, conformity with these expectations and internalization of 3 cultural values, self-reliance, cooperation and compliance.

Type of M: Semiprojective, self-report inventory, parent and teacher rating scales.

Age: 3 - 5 years

Comment: Test was used with under privileged Australian preschool children. It was found that these children had significantly higher perceptions of the culture's expectations for self-reliance and cooperation and displayed significantly greater conformity with these expectations and greater internalization of these values than a control group (which did not attend nursery).

2) Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory

Preschool - Kindergarten Form (also called What Face Would You Wear?)

(See I B, 4)

Measures child's role expectation in regard to school. The sources examined yielded few tests in this area, perhaps examination of the sociological literature would reveal additional role expectation assessment techniques?

B) Role Integration - Role Conflict

Raizen et al (1974, p. 234) indicate that "If Head Start were effective either in helping children avoid pathological solutions to social role conflicts or, better yet, in facilitating resilient, growth-oriented styles of multiple role integration, its contribution to long-term social competence would be inestimable."

To what extent do these role expectations provide conflict in the child? To what extent is the child successfully able to integrate role expectations? What are the ways in which potentially conflicting roles are handled by children who are successful and unsuccessful? How does success or lack of success relate to the parent's attitudes Area (VI) and the correlation of these to teacher's attitudes Area (VIII)?

Partial answers to some of these questions can be provided by data obtained in other areas. It might be conjectured that to the extent that the child is successful in the resolution of his/her role conflicts, various aspects of self-concept would tend to be higher. (Area I)

It might also be hypothesized that success in resolution of role conflict would be expressed in more positive attitudes toward school Area (V).

8. Other Measures of Good Socioemotional Development

A) Archival Data. These include all records and reports routinely kept on the children in a school system. (Raizen et al 1974, p. 190) Walker (1973) refers to these data as "unobtrusive measures" because they rely on procedures that require the researcher only to examine existing reports.

The following list is taken from Raizen et al (1974, p. 190) with the exception of the last item. These authors recommend use of coding system for giving comparable scores to child outcomes under different record-keeping methods.

1. Placement, tracking or "special class" assignment.
2. Attendance and lateness rates.
3. Referrals to school nurse.
4. School success and failure indices such as non academic grades special awards and demerits.
5. Frequency of being sent out of classroom for misbehavior.

A recent test has included a manual for coding some forms of archival data and is worth considering. It is still in the experimental stage though it looks promising: School Records Coding Manual and Pupil Recording Form

Author: N.F. Watt
Source: Johnson (1976, pp. 576-577)
Variable: Classroom Behavior
Type of M: Coding System and rating scale
Comment: "It offers a highly specific system for coding the ad lib remarks about children's classroom behavior, as recorded in cumulative school records."

B) Scales of Early Adjustment

These scales are geared to measuring the effects of Head Start on school readiness. According to Walker (Raizen et al, 1974) these early gains influences the relationship that the child establishes with the teacher and mutual expectations about the child's future performance. Raizen et al give low priority to these measures. They recommend that a specific set of scales based on those used by Stearns (1971) and Wolff and Stein (1967) be adapted for use.

8. Other Measures of Good Socioemotional Development

A) Archival Data. These include all records and reports routinely kept on the children in a school system. (Raizen et al 1974, p. 190) Walker (1973) refers to these data as "unobtrusive measures" because they rely on procedures that require the researcher only to examine existing reports.

The following list is taken from Raizen et al (1974, p. 190) with the exception of the last item. These authors recommend use of a coding system for giving comparable scores to child outcomes under different record-keeping methods.

1. Placement, tracking or "special class" assignment.
2. Attendance and lateness rates.
3. Referrals to school nurse.
4. School success and failure indices such as non academic grades special awards and demerits.
5. Frequency of being sent out of classroom for misbehavior. A recent test has included a manual for coding some forms of archival data and is worth considering. It is still in the experimental stage though it looks promising: *School Records Coding Manual and Pupil Recording Form*

Author: N.F. Watt
Source: Johnson (1976, pp.576-577)
Variable: Classroom Behavior
Type of M: „Coding System and rating scale
Comment: It offers a highly specific system for coding the ad lib remarks about children's classroom behavior, as recorded in cumulative school records."

ADDENDUM I

Role-Taking Skills -

1. General discussions:

   Weinstein (1969)
   Shantz (1975)
   Hoffman (1976)
   O'Connor (1975)

2. Spatial Perspective

   Shlatas & Flavell (1976)
   Gottman et. al. (1975)

3. Ability to identify simple emotions felt by another from facial cues or knowing the situation

   Mossler et. al. (1975)
   Shantz (1975)
   Urberg & Doherty (1976)
   Borke, Interpersonal Awareness Test (Johnson, 1976 p. 393)

4. Social conditional reasoning skills -
   i.e. reasoning from a premise to its logical conclusion in reasoning about probably behavior of others

   Greenberg et. al (1977)

5. Causal attribution of emotion

   Green, (1977)

6. Ability to take the role perspective of another on social tasks

   Feffer & Gourevitch in Gottman et. al (1975)

7. Role taking ability and communications skills

   Shantz (1975)
   Delia (?)
   Wood (1977)
   Brunner (1975)
   Gottman et. al. (1975)
   Asher & Porke (1975)

ADDENDUM II: DEVELOPMENTS AND SELF-HELP

The following is a list of techniques measuring development and self-help. Time limitations did not permit a more intensive examination of this area of measurement. It is our feeling that use could be made of selected parts of these scales - for example to self-help skills, but that other parts duplicate information obtained through more specific measures, for example social skills. The problems of the nature of population tested to arrive at norms can be dealt with by use of a criterion approach as suggested in the introduction.

1) Checklist for Early Recognition of Problems in the Classrooms (Johnson, 1976 p. 1171)

2) Social Activities Scale (Johnson, 1976, p. 1210)

3) Developmental Profile (Head Start Test Collection, Social Skills (1977, p. 5)

4) Yesill Developmental Schedule (Head Start Test Collection, social skills, 1977 p.5)

5) Vineland Social Maturity Scale (Head Start Test Collection, Social Skills, 1977 p. 11)

6) Lexington Developmental Scale & Lexington Development Scale Screening Instrument, (Johnson 1976, p. 93)

7) Marshalltown Behaviorial Development Profile, (Johnson, 1976 p. 95)

8) Scale for Rating Pupil Development, (Johnson, 1976, p. 129)

9) A Study of the Developmental Behavior of Culturally Disadvantaged Children: A Special Study Report on the PAR. March 1968 Duke University, N.C.
ED044430 TM000124

DOMAIN: SOCIO-EMOTIO

AREAS	I-SELF CONCEPT	II PEERS	III Classroom Behavior*	IV Task Behavior**
D I M E N S I O N S	A. General a) Child report b) inferred B. As Learner Student a) child report b) inferred C. Locus of Control D. Social Self E. Body Image F. Racial Self Concept.	A. Peer Acceptance B. Peer Interaction Style (observational Techniques) C. Response Range in Relation to Inter-personal Stimuli	A. Evaluation Based upon Teacher's Role Expectations (teacher-generated constructs) B. Teacher & Observer Evaluation Based upon Standardized Constructs a) General instruments b) Screening devices c) Observation instruments C. Global Teacher Estimates	A. Direction Following B. Task completion & attention control C. Test-taking Behavior D. Reflectivity E. Creativity F. Goalsetting G. Curiosity & Competence Motivation H. Intentional & Incidental Learning Cues Reinforcement Style I. Response Range J. Non-Social Executive Skill K. Other

*This area includes child-teacher, child-peer, child-task, interactions as measured by the teacher using rating scales & general classroom behavior measured by use of observation scales.

**This area includes child-task behavior as measured by specific tests or manipulations.

NAL

V School Attitudes	VI Home & Parents	VII Child Social Role Perceptions	VIII Other
A. Child's Attitudes Toward. Teacher, School Environment Peers & Tasks (expressed by child)	A. Parental Role Expectations for Child a) as student b) in Ceneral	A. Child's Perceptions of Teacher, Parent, Peer Expectations for His/Her Role as Student, child & Friend	A. Archival Data
B. Importance Child Attaches to School & Intellectual Pursuits (expressed by child)	B. Parental & Observer's Ratings of Child's Behavior at Home.	B. Role Integration & Role Conflict.	B. Scales of Early Adjustment
C. Parental Assessment of Child's Attitude Toward School	C. Parental Expectations for Child's Academic Success		
D. Teacher Assessment of Child's Attitude Toward School.	D. Parental Involvement in School a) Archival Data b) Importance of School Success to Parent		
	E. Parental Attitudes Toward Child's School Experience		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Note: ED numbers in the citation refer to ERIC Document Number and can be located in any ERIC Microfiche Collection)

Part I. References Cited in Paper

Anderson, S., & others. Priorities and directions for research and development related to measurement of young children. (Rep. No. PR-72-22 under Office of Child Development Grant No. H-2973 A/H/O. U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare) Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Anderson, S., & Messick, S. Social competency in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10 (2), 282-293.

Angrist, S.S., & Borke, H. An observational system for the evaluation of pre-school programs; Research & Development. Urban Education, 1974, 9 (3), 284-298. Asher (1976) April

Baumrind, D. Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. Young Children, 1970, 26 (2), 104-119.

Berger, M.M. Working with people called parents. N.Y.: Brunner/Mazel, 1977.

Bikson, T. Social and personal development. In S. Raizen, & others, Design for a national evaluation of social competence in head start children. California: Rand Corporation, 1974, R-1557-HEW.

Bronson, M.B. Executive competence in preschool children. April 3, 1975. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30 - April 3, 1975). (ED 107 378)

Bruner, J.S. Poverty and childhood. Oxford Review of Education 1975, 1, (1), 31-50

Cunningham, Jo L., and Boyer, R.P. Development of an observational rating schedule for presschool children's peer-group behavior. (ED 056 055).

Damon, W. Measurement and social development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, (Chicago, Illinois, August 30 - September 3, 1975). (ED 119 812).

Dearden, R.F. Needs in Education.

Delia, J.G. & Clark, R.A. Cognitive complexity, social perception and listener-adapted communications in 6-8-10-12-year old boys. Communications Monographs, in press.

Emmerich, W. Recent structural approaches to personality development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (82nd, New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1974). (ED 097 600).

Emmerich, W. Structure and change in the behavior of economically disadvantaged preschool children. Paper presented at a Symposium on dimensions of competence in classrooms; Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 3, 1975).

Dearden, R.F. 'Needs' in education. In Education and the development of reason. Dearden, R.F., Hirst, P.H., and Peters, R.S. (Eds.) London: Routledge, Keagan Paul, 1972.

Hartup, W. The needs of young children and the needs of research: Psychosocial development revisited. Published 1973. Paper presented at the conference of the National Assocation for the Education of Young Children (Atlanta, Georgia, 1972). (ED 071 779)

Hoffman, M.L. Empathy, role taking, guilt, and development of altrustic motives. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior, theory research, and social issues. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976, 124-143.

Kagan, J. On class differences and early development. December 28, 1969. (ED 044 167).

Kennedy, E.R., and Ely, M. Development of a new approach to the measurement of integrative teacher behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (April, 1976).

Lynch, D.O., and Hammes, R. The effects of school environment on disadvantaged kindergarten children, with and without a head start background. Final report. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Bureau of Research, November 14, 1969. (ED 041 640)

Messick, S., and Barrows, T.S. In National society for the study of education yearbook, 1971. Gordon, I.J. (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 261-295.

Messick, S., and Barrows, T.S. Strategies for research and evaluation in early childhood education. In Ira Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education. Chicago,: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Nicholls, J.G. Causal attributions and other achievement-related cognitions: Effects of task outcome, attainment value and sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, (13), 379-389.

O'Malley, J.M. Research perspective on social competence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1977, 23, (1), 29-44.

Emmerich, W. Recent structural approaches to personality development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (82nd, New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1974). (ED 097 600).

Emmerich, W. Structure and change in the behavior of economically disadvantaged preschool children. Paper presented at a Symposium on dimensions of competence in classrooms; Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 3, 1975).

Dearden, R. F. 'Needs' in education. In Education and the development of reason. Dearden, R. F., Hirst, P. H., and Peters, R. S. (Eds.) London: Routledge, Keagan Paul, 1972.

Hartup, W. The needs of young children and the needs of research: Psychosocial development revisited. Published 1973. Paper presented at the conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (Atlanta, Georgia, 1972). (ED 071 779)

Hoffman, M. L. Empathy, role taking, guilt, and development of altrustic motives. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior, theory research, and social issues. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976, 124-143.

Kagan, J. On class differences and early development. December 28, 1969. (ED 044 167).

Kennedy, E. R., and Ely, M. Development of a new approach to the measurement of integrative teacher behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (April 1, 1976).

Lynch, D. O., and Hammes, R. The effects of school environment on disadvantaged kindergarten children, with and without a head start background. Final report. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Bureau of Research, November 14, 1969. (ED 041 640).

Messick, S., and Barrows, T. S. In National society for the study of education yearbook, 1971. Gordon, I. J. (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 261-295.

Messick, S., and Barrows, T. S. Strategies for research and evaluation in early childhood education. In Ira Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Nicholls, J. G. Causal attributions and other achievement-related cognitions: Effects of task outcome, attainment value and sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, (13), 379-389.

O'Malley, J. M. Research perspective on social competence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1977, 23, (1), 29-44.

Raizen, S., & others. Design for a national evaluation of social competence in head start children. California: Rand Corporation, 1974. R-1557-HEW.

Rayder, N. F., & others. The responsive classroom observation schedule--background and development. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975. (ED 107 375).

Rentfrow, R. K. New directions in open classroom evaluation: Situational tasks. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Montessori Society (Colorado, June 17-21, 1975).

Shantz, C. U. Communication skills and social-cognitive development. Tech Report Series Report No. 7. July, 1975. (ED 116 795).

Shantz, C. U. The development of social cognition. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research, 1975, 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 257-323.

Shure, M. B., and Spivalk, G. Interpersonal problem solving intervention for mother and child. (ED 143 415).

Starkey, K., and Boyce, J. A., III. Experimenter effect in a study of racial identification by urban kindergarten children. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April, 1975).

Shavelson, R. J.; and others. Self-concept: Validation. of construct interpretation. Review of Educational Research, Summer, 1976, 46 (3) 407-441.

Soar, R. S., and Soar, Ruth M. Early childhood education: An empirical analysis of selected follow thru programs; An example of a process approach to evaluation. In National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook 1971. Gordon, I. J. (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 229-259.

Spivack, G., and Shure, M. B. Social adjustment of young children. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1974.

Susman, E. J., & others. Observational child study: An empirical analysis of recent trends and directions. May, 1976. (ED 127 013).

Taylor, L. Evaluation of preschool programs. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Convention (Toronto, June, 1976). (ED 135 481).

Washington, R. O. Toward a theory of social competence: Implications for measuring the effects of head start programs. Urban Education, 10 (1), 1975, 73-85.

White, B. L., & others. Adult assessment scales. Harvard Preschool Project, 1974.

White, B. L. Critical influences in the origins of competence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1975, 21 (4) 243-266.

Zimiles, H. A radical and regressive solution to the problem of evaluation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Minnesota Round Table in Early Childhood Education (June 1973). (ED 097 958).

Part II. Sources of Measurement Techniques

Coller, A. R. Systems for the observation of classroom behavior in early childhood education. 1972. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education. (ED 068 204).

Collins, Roy C. Children and society: Child development and public policy. (Unpublished paper). September 1977.

Guthrie, P. D., & others. Measures of social skills: An annotated bibliography. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service. O.C.D. (DHEW), Washington, D.C., August 1971. (ED 056 085).

Head Start Test Collection. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
Measures of Social Skills (May 1977)
Self-Concept Measures (June 1973)
Tests for Spanish-Speaking Children (July 1977)

Johnson, O. G. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II. (2 volumes). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.

Raizen, Senta, & others. Design for a national evaluation of social competence in head start children. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, November 1974. (ED 104 569).

Walker, D. K. (Deborah). Socioemotional measures for preschool and kindergarten children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Part III. Role Taking, Social Cognition and Communication Skills

Asher, S. R. Children's ability to appraise their own and another person's communication performance. Developmental Psychology, 1976, (1) 12, 24-32.

Asher, S. R., and Parke, R. D. Influence of sampling and comparison processes on the development of communication effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, pp. 64-75.

Delia, J. G. & Clark, R. A. Cognitive complexity, social perception & listener-adapted communication in 6 - 8 -, 10 - & 12 -year old boys. Communication Monographs, in press

Gottman, J. Gonso, J. & Rosmusan, B. Socail interaction, social competence & friendship in children. Child Development, 1975, 46, 709-718.

Green, Subank. Caused attribution of emotion in kindergarten children. Developmental Psychol., 1977, 15, (5) 533-534.

Greenburg, M. T., Maron, R. S. & Mossler, D. G. The development of conditional reasoning skills. Developmental Psychol., 1977, 13, (5) 527-528.

Mossler, D. G. & others. Conceptual perspective taking in 2 - 6-year old children. Developmental Psychol., 1976, 12, (1) 85-86.

O'Connor, M. Decentration revisited: a two factor model f r role taking development in young children. Paper presented at SRCD Convention Denver, 1975, ED116790 PS 008233.

Rothenberg, B. Children's social sensitivity and the relationship to inerpersonal competence, intrapersonal comfort, and intellectual level. Developmental Psychol., 4, 1970, 2, 335-350.

Salatas, H. & Flavell, J. H. Perspective Taking: the development of two components of knowledge. Child Development, 1976, 47, 103-109.

Selman, R. L. A devèlopmental approach to interpersonal and moral awareness in young children. Some theoretical and educational perceptives. First draft. June 20, 1974. ED 097 959.

Segel, I. E. & Cocking, R. R. Cognition and communication: a dialectic paraign for development. In M. Lewis & L. Rosenblum (Eds.), Communication and Language: the Origins of Behavior, 5. NY: Wiley, in press.

Urberg, K. A. & Docherty, E. M. Development of Role-Taking skills in young children. Developmental Psychol., 1976, 12 (3) 198-203.

Weinstein, E. A. The development of interpersonal competence. In. D.A. Goslem (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory, Research Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing, 1969.

Wood, B. S. (Barbara) (Ed.), Development of functional communication competencies: Pre-K-grade 6. April 1977. ERIC, ED 137 858.

Yarrow, M. R. & Waxler, C. Z. & others. Dimensions and correlates of prosocial behavior in young children. Child Development, 1976, 47, 118-125.